

AN

# A P P E A L

TO THE

## METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

---

BY REV. O. SCOTT.

---

PART I.—SLAVERY AND THE CHURCH, . . . . .	page 5.
II.—BIBLE ARGUMENT, . . . . .	33.
III.—GENERAL CONFERENCE, . . . . .	58.
IV.—CONFERENCE RIGHTS, . . . . .	77.
V.—SUNDRY ARTICLES, . . . . .	104.

OSWEGO  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

---

BOSTON:

DAVID H. ELA, PRINTER AND PUBLISHER.

1838.

## PREFACE.

---

THE following Appeal has, I trust, been made in the fear of God, and with an eye to his glory. It is with a deep feeling of responsibility to God, the Church, and the world, that it is now committed to the public. It is more particularly *designed*, as its title indicates, for the M. E. Church; though in consequence of the identity of anti-slavery principles, the greater portion of it will be found to contain matter of general interest.

The Anti-Slavery discussion forms a new era in the history of the M. E. Church. The principal facts and arguments connected with this discussion, should have a more permanent existence than that of newspaper articles; and I doubt not, the time will come, when a repository containing such matters will be highly valued.

The "Wesleyan Anti-Slavery Review" will be published again in 1839 and 1840, unless some unforeseen circumstance should prevent it.

The present number contains matter enough to fill a common sized octavo volume of from 300 to 400 pages. The publication of this work was not determined upon till a short time before it was commenced. Should it be continued, more attention will be paid to future numbers. The next number will contain more matter of general interest, though it will be suited to the discussion in the M. E. Church. The history of this discussion will be continued in future numbers, and new and important topics will be introduced.

Two numbers more will make a volume of about 450 pages, which will contain more matter than two common sized octavo volumes of 500 pages each. Such a volume will be of consequence hereafter. Those who wish for the work complete, will do well to *preserve this*, as they may not be able to obtain it hereafter.

But for the refusal of the Advocate to admit articles candidly and temperately written, from abolitionists, when they have been misrepresented and abused, this work would have had no existence. It is anti-abolition which has produced it, and the same cause has produced Methodist Anti-Slavery Conventions also!

This Appeal embodies many important *facts*—facts which will be found very convenient for reference, and which could not have been obtained without going over a host of newspapers, and not a few books. The labor of collecting and arranging them, has been by no means a *small matter*.

The next number of the Review will contain a multitudinous array of *facts*, touching slavery—the treatment of the slaves—safety of emancipation, &c. &c.;

and the third number will contain a copious index to the volume, should the work be continued.

For the sentiments contained in this Appeal, the author alone is responsible; though he believes them to be the sentiments of Methodist abolitionists generally.

A portion of the *original* matter in some of the articles, has been published through other mediums; but the whole has been *remodelled*, and it is believed *improved*.

The extracts (to say nothing about the original matter) interspersed through the work, are very valuable. Those contained in Part I. are alone worth the price of the work. The examination of ancient and modern Methodism, brings many important facts to view. The Southern testimony, on pages 22 and 23—the extracts from the Synod of Kentucky—and the extracts from letters of Methodist preachers, with which the first part closes, (some of which have not been before published,) are all worthy of a *second*, and even a *third* reading.

Those who can have patience to plod through the article on the last General Conference, will find the doings of that body, and their "Reviewer," placed in their true light. The misrepresentations which have abounded on this subject, have made it necessary to go into a thorough examination of this affair. Those who desire a correct view of the subject, will please give this article a careful perusal. That those who have lavished their misrepresentations heretofore, will cease from this practice *at once*, is too much to hope. It may, therefore, be expected that this and other parts of the work will be attacked. But let whatever may be said against it, be carefully compared with the statements it contains, and I have no fear as to the result of any attacks, however illiberal and unfair they may be.

The subject of "Conference Rights" is important to the vital interests of Methodism, and it has become identified somewhat with the anti-slavery discussion in the M. E. Church—though any decision respecting that matter does not necessarily affect the great question of the emancipation of the slaves, which, above all others, should be constantly kept in view. I make no apology for the lengthy extracts which I have inserted from Rev. Messrs. G. F. Cox and T. MERRITT, on this subject. The arguments which they contain are *unanswered* and *unanswerable*.

This Appeal has been prepared in view of the day of final accounts. The author expects to give an account for this, as well as all his other acts, at the judgment seat of Christ. He does not pretend that he has used, in every instance, the *best words*—though he has not intended to be unnecessarily severe. It is true he has used "great plainness of speech," but he has nowhere, he thinks, *impeached the motives* of any brother. At any rate, he has not intended to do this.

Imperfect as the work is, it is submitted to the public with a willingness, that, however it may be received at present, posterity should criticize its *arguments*, and sit in judgment upon its most *severe* and *pointed* expressions.

O. SCOTT.

Lowell, March 30, 1838.

# APPEAL.

## PART I.—SLAVERY AND THE CHURCH.

### FATHERS AND BRETHREN,

Will you suffer an humble individual to address you on a most important subject? A subject to which he has devoted much attention for a number of years, and which he believes to be intimately connected with the dearest interests of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and of this nation. If he knows his own heart, he is influenced by no other motives than those of kindness and love, in making this *appeal*. Read, dear brethren, and then judge.

### MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH.

The Methodist Episcopal Church holds a large share of the moral power of this nation. It is therefore of the greatest importance that she be right on all moral questions. She cannot be neutral on any great question of moral reform. This is utterly impossible. Her influence will be given to one side or the other of all the moral subjects agitated in the land. And it is to be feared, that hitherto, her influence on the Slavery question, has been on the *wrong side*. This has not, perhaps, been the *design* of the majority; but such, it is believed, has been the *fact*, her disciplinary regulations to the contrary notwithstanding. At any rate, this is a matter that demands our serious examination. If we are indeed as much as ever convinced of the great evil of Slavery, is there not an inconsistency between our *convictions* and *practice*? Are we doing as much as ever to get rid of slavery? I do not ask, whether we are all abolitionists; but are we doing *any thing* to purge the Church and save the country? Do one

half of our ministers, even in the free States, pray publicly for the manacled slave? I know the Bible requires us to pray for "all men;" but are not the slaves, in too many instances, forgotten, even by those who call themselves abolitionists? "As much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery," and yet neglect to *pray* for the slaves!

### THE CHURCH AND SLAVERY.

There are, dear brethren, about 70,000 slaves in our Church. Hundreds of our ministers, and thousands of our members are slave holders—and in many instances they enslave their own brethren and sisters in Christ! Our general rule on the subject of slavery is proclaimed by our Southern brethren to be a *dead letter*! It was not always so. Methodist preachers were once anti-slavery men, not only in word, but in deed and in truth. No Methodist minister attempted to write a Bible argument thirty, nor even ten years ago, to justify slave-holding under *any* circumstances; but now our college and church officers, and even one of our bishops has done this! No conference of Methodist ministers would have asserted, that slavery is "*not a moral evil*," even ten years ago; but now this doctrine is boldly and openly proclaimed by the Georgia Conference, and in substance by the Baltimore Conference. Our last General Conference condemned, plainly and pointedly, modern abolitionism, while it refused to express any sentiment against slavery, though earnestly requested to do so. How unlike the doings of former General Conferences! Several of



our annual conferences have taken strong ground against abolitionism; but slavery has been passed over in silence, except in two instances, where a simple construction has been given to our disciplinary regulations on that subject. The Eastern conferences have indeed desired to oppose slavery, as Methodist conferences used to do, but our bishops have interposed, and prevented any action upon the subject!

#### THE INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY.

Slavery has gained an awful, and an alarming ascendancy over both Church and State, within a few years past. And how it is possible for any sober man to believe that there is as much opposition to slavery now in our country, as there was fifty years ago, I cannot conceive. Such must not only believe without evidence, but *contrary to the clearest evidence*.

There are four times as many slaves in our country now as there were fifty years ago; and there is, to say the least, four times as much of the *spirit of slavery*, both in Church and State, as there was then. I speak now of the whole people, North and South. If the *spirit of slavery* had not increased with the increase of slaves, a very dark cloud, that now hangs over the country, would be dissipated.

#### OUR CONDUCT.

To say, that republicans and Christians love slavery now better than they did fifty years ago, or, in other words, that they hate it less, is making, I admit, a very strong statement. And I am sorry that there are so many facts to authorize it. If we are indeed as much as ever *opposed* to slavery, (to say nothing about being convinced of the "great evil,") then the Church has been slandered by modern abolitionists;—but if the contrary be the fact, then the present agitation, or some other, is loudly called for. The facts upon this point are not to be gathered so much from existing regulations, which have come down to us from former times, but which are acknowledged to be a dead letter, as from our present conduct. If the Methodist Church were to make a law saying, that we are all in favor of slavery, it would not prove that those are in

favor of it, who are laboring day and night to destroy it. Neither do regulations, saying, we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery, prove that we are, as a people, as much as ever opposed to it, providing our conduct is the reverse of what it once was. I think, however, I would be willing, so far as the success of the argument is concerned, to rest it on a comparison of our present with our former *disciplinary provisions*. But I shall avail myself of another consideration, viz. How are these provisions carried out at the present time, compared with thirty, forty, and fifty years ago?

The attention of many of our brethren has been called to this contrast of ancient and modern Methodism as connected with slavery, again and again. But it is my present purpose to go more fully into this subject—to examine both our Church regulations and our *practice*; and I, for one, will agree to abide the issue of facts and sound reasoning, whatever may be the result.

#### MR. WESLEY'S SENTIMENTS.

Mr. Wesley's sentiments on the subject of slavery are well known. He was the uncompromising opponent of that system of abominations, called SLAVERY, in all hands and under all circumstances. Never did he write an apology for the slave-holder under any circumstances—much less did he ever attempt to sanction the relation of Master and Slave by the Golden Rule! He would as soon have defended horse-stealing and highway robbery, from the Bible! No abolitionist has ever expressed views more *ultra* on this subject, than Mr. Wesley, in his tract on Slavery. And I have no doubt but it would be death to any Methodist minister to distribute this tract of our venerable founder among Methodists, through the Southern States. I know this tract is contained in his works, and that many copies of these are in the slave-holding States; but let this part of his works be printed separately, and circulated extensively, and see what the consequence would be, even among Methodists and Methodist ministers! There is no connection between this tract and his other works. It was first written and published separately. Modern abolitionism, then, in the M. E.

Church, is, to say the least, *as ancient as JOHN WESLEY*; if indeed the rankest of us may presume to claim affinity with him in bold denunciations of slavery and slave holders. He held to "instant" emancipation, which comes very near being *immediate*. The following is a short extract from his work on Slavery:

"And this equally concerns every gentleman that has an estate in our American plantations; yea, ALL SLAVE HOLDERS, OF WHATEVER RANK AND DEGREE; seeing men buyers are exactly on a level with men stealers. Indeed you say, 'I pay honestly for my goods; and I am not concerned to know how they are come by.' Nay, but you are; you are deeply concerned to know they are honestly come by. Otherwise you are a partaker with a thief, and are not a jot honest than him. But you know they are not honestly come by; you know they are procured by means nothing near so innocent as picking of pockets, house breaking, or robbery on the highway. You know they are procured by a deliberate series of more complicated villany, (of fraud, robbery, and murder,) than was ever practiced either by Mahommedans or Pagans; in particular, by murders of all kinds; by the blood of the innocent poured upon the ground like water. Now, it is your money that pays the merchant, and through him the captain and African butchers. You, therefore, are guilty, yea, PRINCIPALLY GUILTY, of all these frauds, robberies, and murders. You are the spring that puts all the rest in motion; they would not stir a step without you; therefore, the blood of all these wretches who die before their time, whether in their country or elsewhere, lies upon your head. 'The blood of thy brother' (for, whether thou wilt believe it or no, such he is in the sight of Him that made him) 'crieth against thee from the earth,' from the ship, and from the waters. O, whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry before it is too late; instantly, at any price, were it the half of your goods, deliver thyself from blood guiltiness! *Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house, thy lands, are at present stained with blood.* Surely it is enough; accumulate no more guilt; spill no more the blood of the innocent! Do not hire another to shed blood; do not pay him for doing it! Whether you are a Christian or no, show yourself a MAN! Be not more savage than a lion or a bear!

"Perhaps you will say, 'I do not buy any negroes; I only use those left me by my father.' So far it is well; but is it enough to satisfy your own conscience? *Had your father, have you, has any man living, a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting Revelation aside.* It cannot be, that either war, or contract, can give any man such a property in another as he has in his sheep and oxen. *Much less is it possible that any child of man should ever be born a slave.* Liberty is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature.

"If, therefore, you have any regard to justice (to say nothing of mercy, nor the revealed law of God), render unto all their due. Give liber-

ty to whom liberty is due, that is, to every child of man, to every partaker of human nature. Let none serve you but by his own act and deed, by his own voluntary choice. Away with all whips, all chains, all compulsion! Be gentle toward all men; and see that you invariably do unto every one as you would he should do unto you. J. WESLEY."

Such were the *spirit, sentiments*, and *language* of him whose praise is in all the churches,—and whose soul, we doubt not, is with God. Was this the language of our last General Conference? Was this the language of the Georgia and Baltimore Conferences at their last sessions? Does this sound like the Counter Appeal, and slavery enjoined by the *Golden Rule*? Spirit of Wesley, where hast thou fled? Who now, in the M. E. Church, except the persecuted abolitionists, cry out for "instant" emancipation? Who now puts "all slave holders, of whatever rank and degree," "EXACTLY ON A LEVEL WITH MEN STEALERS!" Who makes slave holders "partakers with a thief?" Who now charges them with "blood guiltiness?" ("Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house, thy lands, are at present stained with blood!") Certainly not Bishop H., not President F. No; not even the abolitionists! We believe with Mr. Wesley; but alas! we have spoken in *whisper tones* and in *soft language* compared with his.

#### THE ENSLAVEMENT OF CHILDREN.

Is he correct in saying, that it is "impossible that any child of man should ever be born a slave? Liberty is the right of every human creature as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature." Is this a correct sentiment? Can we doubt it? I think not. And if we admit it, what is the character of those who make slaves of children born on their plantations? Just what it would be if they were to go to the shores of Africa, and take children from that country and enslave them! Just what it would be if they were to come to the free States, and take either white children or black ones, and enslave them! The blacks are born as free as the whites—and one black is born as free as another. "No human law can deprive one of that right which he derives from the law of na-

ture," said that old, obsolete divine, John Wesley. No matter then if ten thousand human legislatures make laws, saying that children are slaves—of what avail are they before God? Legislation can never make that which is morally wrong, politically right. The Southern States have the same right to make laws to enslave their white children that they have to enslave the blacks. But we all know that it would be a crime of the same nature to enslave white children, after such laws should be made, that it is now. We have the same right to make laws in the North to enslave our children, that the South have to enslave theirs; but neither we nor they have any more right to make such laws than we have to attempt to legislate the Almighty from his throne! And this business is as bad in the hands of professed Christians and ministers, as it is in the hands of infidels! *Ignorance* is the only apology that can be offered for either. And even this apology cannot be made much longer.

If Mr. Wesley was ultra on this subject, so were our Fathers who put forth the Declaration of Independence! They said, "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *inalienable rights*; that among these are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness." "All men," not all *white* men, but "all men—created equal"—and "*liberty*" an "*inalienable right*." What then is the *character* of that man who makes a slave of a human being, born as free as he is, and with the same inalienable right to liberty? You will fix it by the same standard that you would a man's character, who goes to the shores of Africa, and takes human beings and enslaves them. Neither human laws nor geographical boundaries can change *moral principles*. And the slave holders of the South will find, in the day of final accounts, that the plea, "the laws forbid emancipation," or the laws justified stealing and enslaving innocent children, and keeping them in bondage all their lives, will be but a poor excuse for making merchandize of God's image! Among the Jews, to be "found" with a stolen human being "in his hand," subjected one to the same penalty as if he had been

the original kidnapper—which penalty was *death*! And Mr. Wesley, as has been shown, puts *all slave holding* on the same ground.

How unlike is American Methodism to the principles of Wesley, and Wesleyan Methodism as it now exists in Great Britain?

#### EARLY METHODIST PREACHERS.

Imbued with *such principles*, the preachers sent to this country sixty or seventy years ago, by Mr. Wesley, came with the most deadly enmity to slavery. They preached, talked, and wrote against it, both in the North and South. Bishops Coke and Asbury are admitted to have been hot-headed abolitionists; though it is said they cooled off some, before they died. The former is reported to have kindled up such a fire in South Carolina, as did not go out for thirty years. Would to God it had burned till this time, and burned till it had consumed slavery, root and branch.

It is true, the early Methodist preachers did receive some slave holders into their societies, with the utmost caution, subjoining plain pointed exhortations, and adopting strong rules and regulations against slavery. These pioneers of American Methodism never intended that slavery should be continued in the M. E. Church. Of this fact, we have the best evidence. They perhaps thought they could cure slave holders sooner, when awakened, by taking them under their own immediate watch and care, and dealing plainly and faithfully with them. But in this, I think, they erred. To baptize and ordain an evil is a poor way to cure it. Little, however, did our Fathers suppose, that before their bodies were scarcely cold in the grave, slavery would put in its high claims for a bishop! So do evils increase when once admitted into the Church.

#### DID MR. WESLEY APPROVE OF RECEIVING SLAVE HOLDERS?

We have no reason to believe that Mr. Wesley ever approved of receiving slave holders at all. Not a word can be produced from his writings to show that he did. On the contrary, we can produce evidence to show, that he considered "American slavery the vilest that ever saw the sun"—and that he placed

"all slave holders exactly on a level with men stealers." From his well known sentiments, therefore, we ought not to suppose that he approved of receiving slave holders *at all*, without the most indubitable evidence. But, it may be asked, if Mr. Wesley did not *approve* of it, why did he *suffer* it. I answer, if Mr. Wesley did not approve of the taking the name of *bishop*, by Coke and Asbury, why did he suffer it? He certainly *did not approve of it*, but *disapproved* of it in the warmest terms; and yet they were called *bishops*! In a letter dated "London, Sept. 20, 1788," Mr. Wesley thus writes to Mr. Asbury on this subject: "How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call me a knave or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content: but they shall never, by my consent, call me a *bishop*! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, *put a full end to this!*" See *Wesley's Works*, vol vii. p. 187. I make this extract, not out of any disrespect to our bishops, but to show that Coke and Asbury did some things, or suffered them to be done, which Mr. Wesley warmly disapproved. But it may be said, that had he, in this manner, disapproved of receiving slave holders into the Church, it would be sufficient to settle the point. But how could it be possible for him to disapprove this more strongly than he has done. "American slavery, the *vilest* that ever saw the sun"—and "all slave holders, of whatever rank and degree," "*exactly on a level with men stealers!*" What a license this, to receive such persons into the Church! But how do we know what *private* instruction Mr. Wesley gave his preachers on this subject? How do we know how many letters he wrote them touching this business? It is not to be supposed, that all his letters and private instructions have been published. Again: It may be asked, Why, when he found that they had received slave holders, did he not order them expelled? Perhaps he did. For when he learned that Asbury had taken the name of bishop, he ordered him to "*put a full end to this.*" But did he do it? In a letter dated April 21, 1775, Mr. Wesley ordered Mr. Asbury to return to England "*without delay.*" But did he do so?

We may, therefore, fairly conclude, that slaves were never received into the M. E. Church by Mr. Wesley's authority or approbation.

#### SENTIMENTS OF THE M. E. CHURCH IN 1780.

The early American Methodists were warmly opposed to slavery, however mistaken they might have been in their Church policy on this subject. Now for the evidence. But before giving it, I will just say, that the Western Christian Advocate of Dec. 8, 1837, makes the following statement in relation to this subject.

"Our readers should *know* that our Church has neither *given up* nor *MODIFIED* ANY of her *strong Scriptural doctrines* or *REGULATIONS* on the subject of slavery; the declarations of recent abolitionists or others to the contrary notwithstanding."

And in the Christian Advocate and Journal of Jan. 26, 1838, Rev. N. Pangs says, our Church "*has always held ONE UNDEVIATING LANGUAGE in opposition to slavery.*" Strange statements these!

Four years before our Church was organized in this country, that is, in 1780, the Conference bore the following testimony against it:

"The Conference acknowledges that *slavery is contrary to THE LAWS OF GOD, MAN, AND NATURE, and hurtful to society; CONTRARY TO THE DICTATES OF CONSCIENCE AND PURE RELIGION; and doing what we would not that others should do unto us; and they pass their DISAPPROBATION upon all our friends who keep slaves, and they advise their freedom.*"

This was the "language" of our Church *then*, but is it her language *now*? Was this the *language* of the last General Conference? Is this among "her strong scriptural doctrines or regulations" *now*? Slavery was then "contrary to the laws of God." Now the Golden Rule requires it in certain cases—then, it was "doing what we would not that others should do unto us." Now, it is doing what we *would* that others should do unto us. [See Bish. H.'s Address.] "one undeviating language?" In 1780, the "*disapprobation*" of the Conference was passed upon *all* our friends who keep slaves—now, Bible arguments and addresses from high authority defend the relation of Master and Slave, as in itself a sinless relation. Then universal freedom was "*advised*" ("all our friends") now one of our highest Church officers

contends, that it would be contrary to the Golden Rule, in many instances, to set them free! But it has been asked, and that too by one of the very men who holds that "advice" has the nature and power of law, (and is binding, even upon those to whom it was not given), why they did not *require* their freedom, in the room of "advising" it? Such is the consistency to which men are sometimes driven! But let us see what the Church said in 1784, about *requiring* the freedom of the slaves.

#### SENTIMENTS OF THE CHURCH IN 1784.

In 1784, when our Church was regularly organized, the following rules were in substance, adopted. [See Lee's History of the Methodists.]

"Every member in our Society, who has slaves, in those States where the laws will admit of freeing them, shall, after notice given him by the preacher, within twelve months (except in Virginia, and there within two years) legally execute and record an instrument, whereby he sets free every slave in his possession; those who are from forty to forty-five, immediately, or at farthest at the age of forty-five.

"Those who are between the ages of twenty-five and forty, immediately, or within the course of five years. Those who are between the ages of twenty and twenty-five, immediately, or at farthest at the age of thirty. Those who are under the age of twenty, as soon as they are twenty-five at farthest. And every infant, immediately on its birth.

"Every person concerned, who will not comply with these rules, shall have liberty quietly to withdraw from our Society within the twelve months following; the notice being given him, as aforesaid; otherwise the assistant shall exclude him in the Society.

"No person, holding slaves, shall, in future, be admitted into Society, or to the Lord's Supper, till he previously comply with these rules, concerning Slavery.

"*Those who buy, sell, or give them away, unless on purpose to free them, shall be expelled immediately.*"

From the above rules it will be seen, that the M. E. Church, fifty-four years ago, believed in the justice and safety of "immediate" emancipation. Not only was "every infant, immediately on its birth," to be set free, in those States where the laws allowed of emancipation, but all other slaves in those States were to be set free "*immediately*," or at farthest in a very few years—all who were over forty, in less than five years—those who were over twenty-five, in five years at farthest, and so on. Some of these two classes would, of course, be so near

forty and forty-five, as to be set free in a few months or weeks. And, in all cases, "*immediate*" emancipation seems to have been preferred, as it is first named. Deeds of emancipation were to be given and recorded in all the States which allowed of emancipation, except Virginia, within twelve months; and in that State within two years.

The slave trade was entirely prohibited in all the States, on penalty of "*immediate*" expulsion!" "*Those who buy, sell, or give them away, unless on purpose to free them, shall be expelled immediately.*" Is it so now? Where is the "one undeviating language?" Rev. N. Bangs says he "receives those principles," but does he act upon them? What is he either *saying* or *doing* in favor of such kind of emancipation as is spoken of in the above rules? And if "our Church has neither given up nor modified any of her strong scriptural doctrines or regulations on the subject of slavery," I would ask Br. Elliot, where the above "strong regulations" are?

On this foundation the M. E. Church once stood; but where is she now? She now adopts the motto, "wholly refrain"—and yet holds "*one undeviating language.*" No matter how soon the above rules were suspended. The sooner the worse. We see how the M. E. Church started in her Christian warfare against slavery; and if she backslid in six months, *so much the greater her disgrace!* It shows how soon and how tamely she submitted to the clamor of slave holders. Had she kept her flag of "Death to Oppression," flying for the last fifty-four years,—had she exposed it to the thunders and lightnings and storms at all seasons,—had she evinced the courage of Daniel and the three Hebrews, and of her venerable founder, where would slavery have been now, both in our Church, and throughout the country? *Dying, or dead.*

But in the room of braving the storms of public opinion and persecution, by pursuing the path of righteousness with decision and moral firmness, she has compromised away her "strong regulations," till the little that remains is nothing but a dead letter. And in addition to this, slavery can now boast of the *good example* (!) of hundreds of Methodist travelling preachers, and thou-

sands of church members,—and of how many local ministers, I know not.

#### THE CHURCH IN 1785.

But the M. E. Church did not backslide *all at once*. In 1785, she held the following language :

"We do hold in the DEEPEST ABHORRENCE THE PRACTICE OF SLAVERY, and SHALL NOT CEASE TO SEEK its DESTRUCTION, by all wise and prudent means."

Rev. N. Bangs says, he "receives these principles." But when do we hear him expressing the "deepest abhorrence against the practice of slavery?" To seek the "destruction" of slavery by "all wise and prudent means" *now* means, it would seem, to seek the destruction of *abolitionism*? Our last General Conference sought the destruction of nothing else. And Br. Bangs, as far as his public efforts are concerned, is seeking the destruction of nothing else. That he holds abolitionism "in the deepest abhorrence," there is no reasonable doubt. But will he tell us where this "undeviating language" of "abhorrence" to slavery is found now?

#### THE CHURCH IN 1801.

In a Discipline, printed in 1801, we find the following article, headed *Slavery*. I suppose the greatest part of that article was left out of the Discipline at the General Conference of 1804 or 1808, as it is not in the copy which I have seen, published some time in the year 1808.

##### "Of Slavery.

"*Question.* What regulations shall be made for the extirpation of the *crying evil* of African slavery?"

"*Answer*, 1. We declare that we are *more than ever* convinced of the great evil of African slavery, which still exists in these United States, and do most earnestly recommend to the Yearly Conferences, Quarterly Meetings, and to those who have the oversight of Districts and Circuits, to be exceedingly cautious what persons they admit to official stations in our church; and in the case of future admission to official stations, to require such security of those who hold slaves, for the emancipation of them, *immediately*, or *gradually*, as the laws of the States respectively, and the circumstances of the case will admit; and we do fully authorize all the Yearly Conferences to make whatever regulation they judge proper, in the present case, respecting the admission of persons to official stations in our church.

"2. When any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves, *by any means*, he

shall forfeit his ministerial character in our church, unless he executes, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the State in which he lives.

"3. No slave-holder shall be received into society, till the preacher who has the oversight of the Circuit, has spoken to him freely and faithfully upon the subject of slavery. [Now "wholly refrain."]

"4. Every member of the society, who sells a slave, shall immediately, after full proof, be excluded from the society; and if any member of our society purchase a slave, the ensuing Quarterly Meeting shall determine on the number of years, in which the slave so purchased would work out the price of his purchase. And the person so purchasing, shall immediately after such determination, execute a legal instrument for the manumission of such slave, at the expiration of the term determined by the Quarterly Meeting. And in default of his executing such instrument of manumission, or on his refusal to submit his case to the judgment of the Quarterly Meeting, *such member shall be excluded the society*. Provided also, that in the case of a female slave, it shall be inserted in the aforesaid instrument of manumission, that all her children who shall be born during the years of her servitude, shall be free at the following times, namely—every female child at the age of *twenty-one*, and every male child at the age of *twenty-five*. Nevertheless, if the member of our society, executing the said instrument of manumission, judge it proper, he may fix the times of manumission of the female slaves before mentioned, at an earlier age than that which is prescribed above.

"5. The preachers and other members of our society, are requested to consider the subject of negro slavery with deep attention; [Now let it alone.] and that they impart to the General Conference, through the medium of the Yearly Conferences, [Now the abolition Yearly Conferences are gagged.] or otherwise, any important thoughts upon the subject, that the Conference may have *full light*, [Now the Conference has light enough.] in order to take further steps towards the eradicating this enormous evil from that part of the church of God to which they are connected.

"6. The Annual Conferences are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves, to the legislatures of those States, in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. [What a political measure that was!] These addresses shall urge in the most respectful, but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; proper Committees shall be appointed, by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; [More political still. This is uniting Church and state.] and the *Presiding Elders*, [Now if Presiding Elders only write and lecture they must be removed.] Elders, Deacons, and Travelling Preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses; and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect, to aid the committees, and to further *this blessed undertaking*. [Now it is fanati-

cism.] LET THIS BE CONTINUED FROM YEAR TO YEAR, TILL THE DESIRED END BE ACCOMPLISHED." [We will so do, the Lord being our helper.]

Does the church hold the above "language" now? How could brother Bangs make the surprising statement that the church "has always held *one undeviating language*?" What apology can we make for him? He certainly *ought* to know better. And let it be borne in mind, that this is the brother who is so ready to accuse other brethren of *falsehood*, and that too publicly, and *without cause*! But I will not thus accuse him. I am not so much surprised at such a statement from him, as I am that the editor of the Western Christian Advocate should boldly affirm, "that our church has neither *given up* nor *modified* any of her strong scriptural doctrines or *regulations* on the subject of slavery!" What can this mean?

#### THE RETROGRADE MARCH OF THE CHURCH.

Mark the down hill course of the Methodist Episcopal Church on the subject of slavery for the last *sixty years*. In 1780, "slavery was contrary to the laws of God"—in 1784, it was ordered that it should be exterminated entirely from the church in a very few years—and the buying and selling human beings *at once*—and infant emancipation, *when the laws would allow it, at once*. In 1785 these rules were suspended, but still "slavery was held in the *deepest abhorrence*," and its "*destruction*" was to be unceasingly sought by all "wise and prudent means." In 1801, though the church was "*more than ever convinced* of the great evil of slavery"—yet her wise and prudent means were a lowering down of the standard of 1784—though even then, it was *required* that the subject should be agitated, by exhortations to slave-holders, before receiving them into the church—by making the penalty of selling a slave, under any circumstances, expulsion "*immediately*"—by looking into the subject of slavery "*with deep attention*"—by expressing opinions "*through the yearly conference or otherwise concerning it*"—by the "*appointment of committees*" by the "*con-*

ferences" to petition the state "legislatures" to emancipate their slaves—and "*presiding elders, elders, deacons, and travelling preachers,*" were to aid in this political business! and "*procure as many proper signatures as possible to those addresses*"—and all this was called a "*blessed undertaking*"—and it was to have been "*continued from year to year till the desired end should be accomplished!*" But alas! all the above regulations except the second item, have long since been left out of the discipline; and even that is a *dead letter*! A *part of two other sentences*, in addition to the second item, only remain.

Slavery thirty-five years ago was a "*crying evil*"—now it is simply an "*evil*"—but the Georgia conference says it "*is not a moral evil*"—and Gov. McDuffie says it is not a political evil, but a great blessing, and "*the corner stone of our republican edifice!*" For the last thirty years slavery has been pouring in upon us like a flood; and what, I ask, has been done by *direct means* to do it away? How are we ever "*to spread scriptural holiness over these lands,*" while this system of abominations is countenanced by so many of our ministers and members?

#### THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH IN FAVOR OF SLAVERY.

But we have not only gone down to the bottom of the hill, so far as it regards any decided opposition to slavery, (would to God this were the worst of it) but we have, it is believed, as a church, exerted an influence *decidedly in favor of slavery*. This is a serious charge, but is it not true? Look at the following facts:

#### THE GENERAL RULE NULLIFIED.

1. Our general rule on the subject of slavery is acknowledged on all hands to be a *dead letter*. Why does it then, it may be asked, remain in the Discipline? Because, first, the North would not be exactly willing to have it struck out of the Discipline, dead as it is.—That would be rather too glaring. And, secondly, the South have no great objection to its remaining, providing the North will be pacified with that, in as

much as they have the power to nullify it. But third, it would be a good deal of labor and trouble to alter it, as three-fourths of all the members of all the Annual Conferences must concur with the General Conference, in order to abolish it. And therefore it is permitted to remain.

#### THE CHURCH OPPOSE ABOLITION, BUT NOT SLAVERY.

2. *Who* have raised their voices or used their pens *against* slavery for a number of years past, except a few abolitionists? There are but two sides to this question; one is slavery, and the other is abolition. The church has been fighting abolition and saying nothing against slavery. She has opposed the only measures which have been proposed to bring about emancipation, while she has instituted no others. We can no more be neutral on this question, than we can on the temperance question. Suppose we were to oppose the only temperance measures in operation without engaging in any others, would not our influence be in favor of *intemperance*, especially if we were neither to do nor say any thing against drunkenness; and providing also, that at the same time many of our own ministers were intemperate?

#### SOME OF OUR MINISTERS HAVE DEFENDED SLAVERY.

3. Not only have our brethren refused to oppose slavery, but they have apologized for it in certain circumstances. You may as well deny your existence as to deny this. Some of her ablest ministers, too, have written Bible arguments to justify slave holders!—Will you deny this? Here is the evidence.

##### *The Counter Appeal.*

"The general rule of Christianity not only permits, but in supposable circumstances, enjoins a continuance of the master's authority."

"We say then, that this text in Col. iii. 22—25, proves to a demonstration, that in the primitive Christian church at Colosse, under the apostolic eye, and with the apostolic sanction, the relation of master and slave was permitted to subsist."

"1 Cor. vii. 20—23.

"This text seems mainly to enjoin and sanction the fitting continuance of their present social relations; the freeman was to remain free, and the slave, unless emancipation should offer, was to remain a slave."

"The New Testament enjoins obedience upon the slave as an obligation due to a present *rightful* authority."

W. FISK,  
JOHN LINDSEY,  
B. OTHEMAN,  
H. S. RAMSDELL,  
E. T. TAYLOR,  
JACOB SANBORN,  
H. H. WHITE."

##### *Testimony of Rev. W. Fisk.*

"The relation of master and *slave*, may and does, in many cases, exist, under such circumstances, as free the master from the just charge and guilt of immorality."—*Letter to Rev. T. Merritt.*

##### *Testimony of Rev. E. D. Simms, Professor of Languages, Randolph Macon College.*

"These extracts from HOLY WRIT UNEQUIVOCALLY ASSERT THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY IN SLAVES, together with the usual incidents of that right; such as the power of acquisition and disposition in various ways, according to municipal regulations. The right to buy and sell, and to transmit to children by way of inheritance, is clearly stated. The only restriction on the subject, is in reference to the market, in which slaves or bondmen were to be purchased."

"Upon the whole, then, whether we consult the Jewish polity instituted by God himself; or the uniform opinion and practice of mankind in all ages of the world; or the injunctions of the New Testament and the Moral Law; we are brought to the conclusion, that slavery is not immoral."

"Having established the point, that the first African slaves were legally brought into bondage, the right to detain their children in bondage, follows as an indispensable consequence."

"Thus we see, that the slavery which exists in America, was founded in right."

##### *Testimony of Rev. E. Hedding.*

"The right to hold a slave is founded on this rule, 'Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.'"—*Ch. Ad. and Journal, Oct. 20, 1837.*

And now, dear brethren, I leave it with you to say, whether the above extracts are to be considered in the light of an apology for slavery or not—and whether they do not "in supposable circumstances" and "in many cases" defend slavery from the Bible! And what think you will be the influence of such doctrines upon slave holders in the South?

"As much opposed to slavery as ever"—"one undeviating language!"

#### GENERAL CONFERENCE OF THE M. E. CHURCH IN 1836.

4. *The influence of our last General Conference was in favor of slavery.*—It would not have been so, had they condemned slavery as pointedly as they did "abolitionism;" but this they would



not do. In May, 1836, the following resolution was adopted; yeas 120, noes 14.

*Resolved*, by the delegates of the annual conferences, in the *General Conference assembled*, That they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding States of this Union.

A motion was made to amend the above resolution by putting in the words, "Although we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery," the language of the Discipline, but this motion was lost.

Why did not the General Conference admit this amendment? I know of no other reason, than that a majority wished it to remain a dead letter!—Were they afraid that the South would think them abolitionists if they admitted this amendment? But how could this be, when they pointedly condemned abolitionism in the very resolution to which this was proposed as an amendment? Here they had an opportunity to condemn both slavery and abolition in the same breath. But not a whisper of condemnation did the "patriarchal institution" receive from that body!—This is "seeking the destruction of slavery by wise and prudent means," with a witness! In the eyes of slave holders, to condemn abolitionism, is to sustain slavery. In my opinion, no one thing that has ever taken place in our country, has had such a tendency to sustain slavery as the doings of our last General Conference. Two members of the General Conference were condemned by a vote of that body for making a few remarks on the subject of slavery, out of conference hours, at a public anti-slavery meeting! What more *could* slave holders ask? What more *did* they ask? Nothing but a slave-holding bishop!—And our brethren were, after all, almost as bad in their eyes as abolitionists, because they would not stick to their anti-abolition principles, and give them a slave-holding bishop!

#### A SLAVE-HOLDING BISHOP—OR A DIVISION OF THE CHURCH!

5. As further proof that the influence of our church is in favor of slavery, I will mention the fact, that a

proposal has been made, and probably circulated through the South, since the last General Conference, by a member of that body, [W. A. Smith] to divide the M. E. Church, if they cannot have a slave-holding bishop at the next General Conference; and not one of our General Conference editors—not one of our doctors of divinity—not one of our bishops has raised a voice against it; while all these have condemned again and again the abolitionists!

"The following extract is from a printed circular, which is dated *Richmond, Va.*, July 30, 1836, and signed by Wm. A. SMITH. Whether this document has been sent to all our preachers at the South or not, we do not know, but the copy we have seen, by some means fell into the hands of Mr. N. Dunn, of Kingston, N. York.

"After speaking of the concerns of the Virginia Conference Sentinel, the writer proceeds thus:

"GENERAL CONFERENCE AND SLAVERY.—This is a delicate and painful subject. It is true, the Conference voted promptly against the wild schemes of abolitionists; unfortunately, however, it is equally true that a large majority voted on the principles of abolitionism in the *election of Bishops*,—thus favoring the unrighteous prejudices of abolitionists, and proscribing from this highest office in the Church, men (admitted in private conversations to possess superior qualifications to those appointed) simply because of their connection with slavery. Will the Southern Church *submit* to this? Can they, in justice to themselves, submit to a continuance of this *proscriptive* system! They *will* not!—They *cannot*. The general union of the Northern and Southern Church, however desirable, *cannot be perpetuated* at the price of proscription. If the General Conference do not recede from this position, *I am free to declare to you, that I will on all suitable occasions, seek to establish a SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE*. Will the General Conference recede from this position? Some think they will. For myself, I entertain but little hope. I conversed freely and extensively on the subject at Cincinnati,—have done the same in my late tour through several Northern conferences, and I see but little reason to believe that they will. Should they not at the session of 1840, the establishment of a Southern General Conference will be the only alternative. In view of these facts, it was the current opinion of all the delegates from conferences in slave holding States, with whom I conversed, that it was the duty of these conferences to seek, *without delay, the permanent establishment of a Conference paper, embracing the entire reading community* within their limits, who could be influenced to take a religious paper, and of a bookstore. In this case, if the present difficulties should, by possibility, be amicably adjusted in 1840, which is much to be desired, then no injury would fol-

low to the general union, by an extensively circulated Conference paper and a well established bookstore; but under a different result—a result generally calculated on by most of those with whom I have conversed,—our paper and bookstore would give us a position of INDEPENDENCE, the want of which would be sensibly felt.

"A part of this communication I have felt it my duty to make to you as one, with others, whom you have appointed to publish the Sentinel; and the remainder, as one of your representatives in the late General Conference, in regard to facts which will not meet your eye upon the face of the Journals of that body now publishing; and the whole at this time, because of their connection directly or indirectly with the interests of the Sentinel. This, I sincerely trust, you will seriously and prayerfully consider, and not lay down this communication until you have determined upon a course of action, and then pursue it with diligence, and all cause to fear for the success of the paper will be at an end.

"The reasons for not addressing you through the columns of the Sentinel are apparent; and as a private communication, your own prudence will suggest the use to be made of it,—no improper one, I hope."

Now look at the following extract from an article published in the Virginia Conference Sentinel, of which Mr. Smith was publisher. This article is signed "a voice from Virginia."—Here the General Conference is charged with "gross dissimulations!"

"It was hoped, Mr. Editor, by the friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church, throughout the South, that the resolutions which were adopted by the last General Conference, condemnatory of the principles and conduct of the abolitionists, were indicative of a determination on the part of the Methodist ministry throughout the North, not to interfere with the domestic institutions of the South, but to avoid every thing which might excite sectional jealousies, or tend to interrupt the peace and harmony of our union. But, alas, sir, before the adjournment of that body, palpable evidence was given that those resolutions were GROSS DISSIMULATIONS, and our fond hopes of unanimity and brotherly love, were forced to give place to the strong and obvious conviction, that PROSCRIPTION was the order of the day.

"The election of bishops settled that point beyond a reasonable doubt. No one denied, that the most prominent candidate of the South for the Episcopate, was possessed of superior qualifications for the office over two of those elected. But because he was a slave-holder, this was "disqualification" enough. It was in vain that the southern members warned their northern brethren that this was a spirit of proscription, and that they could not submit. INSULT is heaped upon INJURY, and they are told in the language of the Pittsburgh editor, that they should not "attempt to force themselves as ambassadors of Christ upon those who cannot receive them as such."

"We ask, Mr. Editor, and we do it seriously, will our Southern Conferences send delegates longer to an assembly where a bigoted and reckless majority silence all their appeals for justice and right, by their fanatical clamors; and even trample upon their feelings as men and ministers, with the utmost indifference? We trust not? We hope, sir, if delegates are sent again it will be to fix the BOUNDARY between northern fanaticism and southern rights. Such sentiments as are held at the North, in regard to us and our institutions, imperiously demand that such a course should be pursued."

In a letter to the editor of the Pittsburgh Conference Journal, Mr. Smith disclaimed the authorship of this plan, and said that it was the plan of the whole South, entered into at the late General Conference, the evening of the day on which the bishops were elected. Here brother Fisk, is work for you.

Do you not see the disorganizing spirit of the South? And who has caused it? Not the abolitionists—but their opponents! It is the anti-abolitionists who are accused of "gross dissimulations."

Not a word of reproof have these brethren received from our General Conference papers, or anti-abolition brethren! And why not? Is not this a highly censurable measure? Is it feared that the hot blood of our good brethren in the South would boil over if such treasonable conduct should be censured? And must the abolitionists be abused, *because they will bear it*?

Can such measures as are noted above to sustain slavery be passed over in silence by a church that "holds slavery in the deepest abhorrence?" And is it saying too much, to say, that a church whose officers and editors will pass over such things in silence, and oppose, day and night, the only measures in operation to bring about the emancipation of the slaves, is giving her influence in favor of slavery? If our brethren feel it to be their duty to oppose us, let them do so; but why not oppose slavery too? Why not divide their opposition between "the great evil" of slavery, and the great evil of abolition? Will it be said that the discipline opposes slavery, and that is sufficient? It may be replied, that the General Conference has condemned abolition, and that is sufficient! Why hunt down the abolitionists for holding to the heinous doctrine, that all men are created equal, while slaveholders, exactly on a level, says Mr. Wesley, with mensteal-

ers, are considered among the excellent of the earth? Who would ever infer, from the *conduct* of such a church, that she is convinced of the great evil of slavery? "*By their fruits ye shall know them!*"

#### N. YORK, BALTIMORE AND GEORGIA CONFERENCES.

6. It further appears that the influence of the M. E. Church is in favor of slavery, from what the New York, Baltimore and Georgia Conferences have done, since the last General Conference. How many other conferences have taken a similar course, I know not. But so far as it respects any opposition from our doctors of divinity, bishops, or official papers, every conference in the Union might take a similar course.

#### NEW YORK CONFERENCE.

In June, 1836, the New York Conference passed a resolution requiring all her candidates for deacon's and elder's orders to pledge themselves that they would not agitate the church with discussions on the subject of abolition. The candidates for orders that year were ordained (to the number of over thirty) *under this pledge!* And under it they still are. It is true, at the session of that conference for 1837, this gag-law was not enforced; but the conference has neither reconsidered nor disapproved of the *infamous* resolution, [understand it is the *resolution* which is infamous, not the conference who passed it! their "motives" are not to be impeached]—and there it stands upon their journals as a flaming evidence of the "one undeviating language!" At an early period in the last session of the New York Conference, Rev. N. Bangs offered the following resolution, designed, it would seem, to gag the whole conference. The padlocks, at the preceding session, had only been put on the mouths of the young men.

"That, in view of the sentiments expressed by the last General Conference, on the subject of abolitionism, as well as from a conviction of duty, that it is inexpedient for the members of this conference to indulge in public discussions on this agitating subject, and that, therefore, we pledge ourselves to refrain from all such discussions."

But it would not go. Rev. D. Ostrander, one of the oldest members of the

conference immediately moved that it be laid on the table, and made the order of the day for the fourth of July next. Nothing more was heard of the resolution. But it shows the disposition of one brother, at least, to suppress discussion on a certain subject.

You will bear in mind, brethren, that no sentence of condemnation was passed against slavery at this conference. Slavery, it would seem, is a small evil, compared with abolitionism.

#### BALTIMORE CONFERENCE.

The Baltimore Conference, at its last session, passed the following resolution:

"That in all cases of administration, under the general rule in reference to 'buying and selling men, women and children, &c.,' it be and hereby is recommended to all committees as the sense and opinion of this conference,—that the said rule be taken, construed and understood so as not to make the guilt or innocence of the accused to depend upon the *simple fact of purchase or sale of any such slave or slaves, but upon the attendant circumstances of cruelty, injustice or inhumanity, on the one hand, or those of kind purposes or good intentions on the other, under which the transactions shall have been perpetrated; and farther, it is recommended that in all such cases the charge be brought for immorality, and the circumstances be adduced as specifications under that charge.*"

Here it will be seen the *slave trade* is justified, providing the "purposes are kind," and the "intentions good." "The *simple fact* of the purchase or sale of a slave or slaves," is not to be condemned. Who, but the slave trader himself, can judge of his "purposes and intentions?" And where is there a trader in human bones that would not justify himself on this ground? Our general rule forbids the "intention" of slavery; but the Baltimore Conference not only impliedly justifies slavery, but directly, the slave trade; providing it is not carried on cruelly. Is this a part of the "one undeviating language?" Or if it be a departure from it, has Rev. N. Bangs raised his voice or lifted his pen against such gross violations of the discipline? *Not he.* Did the presiding bishop refuse to put this slave trade resolution? Nay verily! Had an anti-slavery conference taken such an unconstitutional course, how many doctors, editors and bishops would have been out upon them? But such is the influence of slavery in the church, that we cannot have *even our constitu-*

*tional rights!* A resolution in opposition to this was introduced at the last session of the New Hampshire Conference, but the presiding bishop refused to put it, because, as he said, it would bring the conferences into collision! Anti-abolition conferences may come into collision with the Discipline to put down abolition and sustain slavery; but we must not take Discipline ground, if it brings us into collision with them! Is it not so?

#### GEORGIA CONFERENCE.

The Georgia Conference, at its late session, passed the following resolutions, it is said, *unanimously*:

"Whereas there is a clause in the Discipline of our Church which states that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of *slavery*; and whereas the said clause has been *perverted* by some, and used in such a manner as to produce the impression that the Methodist Episcopal Church believed *slavery* to be a *moral evil*,

"Therefore, *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Georgia Annual Conference, that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a *moral evil*."

"*Resolved*, That we view *slavery* as a civil and domestic institution, and one with which, as ministers of Christ, we have nothing to do, further than to ameliorate the condition of the slave, by endeavoring to impart to him and his master the benign influences of the religion of Christ, and aiding both on their way to heaven."

"On motion, it was *Resolved, unanimously*, That the Georgia Annual Conference regard with feelings of profound respect and approbation the dignified course pursued by our several superintendents or bishops in suppressing the attempts that have been made by various individuals to get up and protract an excitement in the churches and country on the subject of *abolitionism*."

"*Resolved*, further, That they shall have our cordial and zealous support in sustaining them in the ground they have taken.—[Extract from the Minutes.]

"THOMAS C. BENNING, Secretary."

On the above resolutions the Christian Guardian, a Methodist paper published in Canada, makes the following sensible remarks:

"ALAS! ALAS! 'You that have tears, prepare to shed them now.'"

"Sainted spirit of the venerable Wesley! Could shame and anger disturb thy deep and holy tranquillity, this would call them into exercise! If for aught thou couldst wish to revisit this 'world of grief and sin,' it would surely be to erase from the records of Methodism so foul a blot upon the character of the system which claims thee as its founder; or to inscribe beneath it, in emblazoned capitals, thy firm protest. Gladly wouldst thou, with Heaven's permission, have recorded, in a 'hand-writing upon the wall' of that conference

room, thy unchanged belief of the true character of 'AMERICAN SLAVERY, the vilest that ever saw the sun.' But 'if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.'"

"Not a moral evil!" In 1780, slavery was "*contrary to the laws of God, man and nature*;" now, "not a moral evil!" In 1784, it was a "crying evil," and any member, in any part of the country, who "sold a slave," was to be "immediately expelled;" now, not a *moral evil*! In 1785, it was held in the "*deepest abhorrence*;" in 1837, "not a moral evil!" It was still a crying evil in 1801; and expulsion was the penalty for selling a slave; but, in 1836, the General Conference condemned abolition, but refused to condemn slavery: therefore, in 1837, an annual conference says that slavery "is not a moral evil!"

Can you, brethren, believe the Georgia and Baltimore Conferences would ever have taken the ground they have, had it not been for the doings of the General Conference? Can you see how a Methodist bishop could possibly put such resolutions to the vote, if a bishop has a right in any case to decline such business? Was that "disciplinary business?" "proper conference business?" In view of all these facts, can you doubt that the influence of the M. E. Church is in favor of slavery? For all this prostration of discipline, the General Conference laid the foundation!

The Georgia Conference evidently believe there are but two sides to this question. They look upon opposition to abolition, as sustaining slavery. Hence their vote of approbation to the bishops for their attempts to put down abolitionism! The very conference which says that slavery "is not a moral evil," resolves to *sustain* the bishops in opposing abolition! Will they not be proud of *such tokens* of "approbation" from *such a source, and in such a connection*? One resolution says slavery "is not a moral evil," another pledges the conference to sustain the "dignified course" of the bishops in "suppressing" abolitionism! Such is the reward which our venerable superintendents have, for their opposition to the abolition conferences!

But to see a body of professed ministers of Christ call that sum of all villainies, (American slavery,) a "civil and domestic institution! How *civil* to *rob*

human beings of all their rights—to enslave the image of God—to steal and enslave innocent children! If this is a *civil* institution, I hardly know where we should go to find a criminal institution! All this passes unreprieved by the official organs of the church!

And now I ask, has not the *spirit* as well as the practice of slavery increased in the M. E. Church for the last fifty years? I can no more doubt this, than I can doubt my existence. If any proposition can be established by facts, this is fully sustained.

And is it not equally certain, that the influence of the M. E. Church has been for some time past in favor of slavery? I cannot resist this conviction. I do not believe the *majority* of the church have intended to exert such an influence; but I am morally certain that the M. E. Church is at this time one of the "great props" of slavery. I do not desire that this prop should be "*split*;" but I would have it cease to support slavery; and the sooner the better. A slave holding ministry! A slave holding church! What inconsistency! Do not many of our ministers and members give their influence and example to what the Bible calls, and Mr. Wesley considers *man-stealing*?

Are there not Achans among us, a thousand times worse than Achan of old. He robbed God in temporal things; we have robbed him of *his own image*? We have stolen, not a wedge of gold, a Babylonish garment, and a few hundred shekels of silver, but we have stolen *human beings*, and have made merchandize of *immortal spirits*! And even in the North, we have apologized for this iniquity—we have connived at it—we have attempted to *cover it up* with the word of God! The highest ecclesiastical tribunal of the Methodist Episcopal Church has solemnly condemned the course of all her ministers and members who dare to plead the cause of the oppressed, while it has refused to breathe a syllable against those who oppress and rob God's intelligent creatures of their all! It appears to me that the language of the Prophet Ezekiel to ancient Tyre, is as applicable to us as it was to her.

"Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so: thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked

up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. "*Thou wast perfect in thy ways* from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee.

"By the multitude of thy merchandize they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and THOU HAST SINNED. Therefore I will cast thee out as profane out of the mountain of God: and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire.

"Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy TRAFFIC; therefore will I bring forth a FIRE from the MIDST OF THEE, it shall DEVOUR THEE, and I will bring thee to ASHES upon the earth, in the sight of all them that behold thee."—Ezekiel xxviii. 14, 15, 16, 18.

The Methodist Church has stood forth in prosperity, as the anointed cherub that covereth. She has dwelt "upon the holy mountain of God"—and she "has walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire?" She was "perfect in her ways" from the day that she was created, "TILL INIQUITY WAS FOUND IN HER!" But she has made "MERCHANTIZE" of the souls of men, and "VIOLENCE" is in the midst of her; and she has sinned." She has "defiled" her "SANCTUARIES" by the iniquity of her "TRAFFIC." And does not the Almighty now threaten to cast her off as profane, and to destroy her? And has he not already brought "forth a FIRE from the MIDST" of her, that has "DEVoured" her, and reduced her to "ASHES?" Is not the portrait of Tyre too true a likeness of the Methodist Episcopal Church? If she does not put away her iniquity, violence, and merchandize in the souls and bodies of men, the days of her prosperity will soon be numbered.

It may be said that slavery has always been in the church, and nevertheless it has prospered. True; but in the first place the M. E. Church was organized with the express understanding that slavery was not to be continued in it. Secondly, many of our fathers did all they could to expel it from the church. But thirdly, it may perhaps be said, that the time of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth he all *Methodists* every where, to repent. The truth is, that for a number of years past, our whole country has been asleep on this subject. Darkness has covered the whole land. But now the light shineth. We cannot sin at so cheap a rate as we have done. The time was, when God blessed our church, though it contained many

*rum-sellers and rum-drinkers.* Many of our ministers and church members used to drink rum, and enjoy religion too, perhaps; but does that prove that they can *now* do so, and retain the favor of God? Certainly not. Neither is it true that God will prosper a slave-holding church *now*, because he has done it in *darker times!* The voice of warning has gone forth, and we now sin at our peril. These are strange times! Never till of late, has a Methodist minister dared to lift his *voice* or *pen*, in defence of slavery; but now the man-stealer and robber finds apologists and defenders among Methodist preachers, and that too in the free States! We now refuse to speak out to the world in the language of the Discipline; and we hedge up the way of those who *dare to do so.* The greater our light, the more aggravated our sins.—God has no attribute which can take sides with us in our struggle to sustain our *craft*, and uphold the great Diana of the Americans! Our church is stained with *blood*, and haunted with the groans of *deathless spirits!* Surely it is enough. God's judgments will not always linger, nor his justice forever sleep. We claim the descendants of *stolen human beings*, as *PROPERTY!* We make slaves of the purchase of the Redeemer's blood. We buy, sell, and enslave many of God's ignorant and oppressed children; and what will be the end of this system of cruelty?

Suppose we admit, for the sake of the argument, (though in some instances we can prove the contrary) that the slaves owned by our ministers and members are as well treated as the system of slavery will allow, still the example of all these men is in favor of slavery—of the whole system of slavery. For they are connected with the system, they hold slaves under the laws—and they do not preach against slavery, unless they preach one thing and practise another. But as example goes before precept, all such preaching would be in vain. But I fear they love slavery too well to preach against it. Brother Winans said on the floor of the last General Conference, that he had become a slave holder from *principle!* This may be the fact in all cases where our brethren hold slaves. This is the most charitable view of the subject. I should be sorry to know that

our brethren are practising what they believe to be wrong, or that they preach a doctrine contrary to their principles. We hope therefore that they are not such hypocrites as to preach one thing and practise another. And if this be not the fact, the conclusion is inevitable, that they support the system of slavery both by precept and example. Talk as much as you please about slavery being a "civil and domestic institution," and a "political thing," it is moral influence that sustains it, and a moral influence can put it down. It is the churches of the North and South that uphold it. If northern Christians would *denounce* it, and southern churches *renounce* it, *its death warrant would be sealed!* But while the Bible is pressed into its service, it will strike deep its roots, and spread wide its branches! What could we ever have accomplished in the temperance cause, had the churches continued to make, sell, and drink rum! And is there not an awful responsibility resting upon Christians all over the land in relation to the slavery question?

#### MR. BIRNEY'S LETTER.

The following sensible remarks are from Mr. Birney's "Letter to the Churches." I believe the larger denominations of Christians possess all the power to crucify slavery, which Mr. B. ascribes to them, and that what he says of the Presbyterians of Kentucky, is equally true when applied to the Methodists of that State. How great, then, must be the responsibility of the churches!

"Well, after all this, you say, 'What can we do?' I answer, you can rise up to-morrow and liberate all whom you hold in bondage. 'But,' you reply, 'what effect would this have upon the great body of slaveholders in the State?' I will undertake to affirm, that, by such a course, small as is your number, you will have crucified the giant sin of our land; his dying struggles may be fierce and long protracted, but his dissolution will be certain, because the death-blow will have been given. The ministers and rulers of any of the larger denominations of Christians have it in their power *to-morrow* to give the fatal wound to slavery in Kentucky, and if in Kentucky, throughout the slaveholding region of the Union; for how would the congregations over which God has placed them, and upon whom they would then be authorized to press this subject with all its overpowering weight, upon sound consciences and Christian hearts, stand in the blaze of such virtuous action, and not be consumed or won by it? If it were to prevail

among Presbyterians alone, how long could the other denominations hold their fellow-men in bondage? Not twelve months, as I honestly believe."

#### MORE SLAVEHOLDING METHODISM.

The South Carolina Conference has followed in the wake of the Georgia Conference! And where will it end? In the midst of all this, the authorities of the Church are dumb! Since writing the above, I have received the following from the Southern Christian Advocate, a Methodist paper, published under the authority of the General Conference. The South Carolina Conference held its late session at Columbia, S. C. On the last day of the session, Jan. 18, Rev. W. Martin introduced resolutions in favor of slavery, similar to those passed by the Georgia Conference.

"Brother Dannelly approved of the doctrine of the resolutions, but remarked on the inconsistency of any action of conference on a subject which was avowed to be foreign from its province. He also brought to view the mischievous use which might be made of it in some parts of the country, where some sought to take up the time, and pervert the business of conference, with debates of abolition.

"Brother W. Capers expressed a conviction that the sentiment of the resolution was universally held, not only by the *ministers of this conference, but of the whole South*. Still he acknowledged the force of the remark made by brother Dannelly; and would willingly do nothing which might ever be perverted into a pretext for the mischievous discussions which were going on in another quarter. The doctrine, and the only true doctrine, was, 'It belongs to Cæsar, and not to the church.' But the subject, right or wrong, had got into the church. He would suggest to the mover of these resolutions, whether it might not be better, all things considered, to adopt the following substitute:

"Whereas, we hold that the subject of slavery in these United States is not one proper for the action of the church, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil authorities,—therefore,

"Resolved, That this conference will not intermeddle with it, farther than to express our regret that it has ever been introduced, in any form, into any one of the judicatures of the church.

"Brother Martin accepted the substitute.

"Brother Betts asked whether the substitute was intended as *implying that slavery, as it exists among us, was not a moral evil?* He understood it as *equivalent to such a declaration*.

"Brother Capers explained, that *his intention was to convey that sentiment fully and unequivocally*; and that he had chosen the form of the substitute for the purpose, *not only of reproving some wrong doings at the North, but with reference also to the General Conference*. If slavery were a *moral evil* (that is, *sinful*), the church would be bound to take cognizance of it; but our affirmation is that it is not a matter for

her jurisdiction, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil government, and of course not sinful.

"The substitute was then unanimously adopted.

"On motion of brother N. Tally, the second Friday in April and September were appointed to be observed as days of fasting and prayer."

What are we coming to? Rev. W. Fisk said, in a speech before the Wesleyan Conference, when he was in England, that there was no proslavery party in the M. E. Church! What will our British brethren think of that statement, when some recent facts shall reach them? If there is no proslavery party in the M. E. Church, I would like to know what would constitute such a party. Here the Rev. W. Capers, (the southern candidate at the last General Conference for bishop) openly avows the sentiment, that slavery is not a moral evil, and which he says is the doctrine of the whole South! This is the fruit, in a Methodist conference, of Bishop Hedding's "golden rule" doctrine—and the end is not yet. I believe Bishop Hedding's motives and intentions were pure, but he has been most unfortunate in putting forth that address. I doubt not he will see the day that he will deeply regret its publication, if he does not already. I would rather never have seen the light, than to have been the author of such a document! We do not begin to see yet, the use that will be made of it by the slaveholders. What has the Georgia and South Carolina Conference done, except to carry out the sentiment of his address? If holding slaves be not only authorized, but required, in many instances, by the golden rule, how can it be a *moral evil*? And if such sentiments are expressed in the North, and that too by the highest offices in our church, is it surprising that conferences composed in part or in whole of slaveholders, will express them? "One undeviating language!" "No proslavery party in the M. E. Church!" So say two of our doctors! The Lord pity our divinity!

Look at the consistency of the South Carolina Conference. In one breath they pronounce slavery, which is wholesale theft and robbery, *not a moral evil*, (for so the resolution was explained) and in the next, they appoint days of fasting and prayer! They need to fast and pray, if any people ever did. The

## RELIGION OF THE SOUTH.

Lord give them repentance. Resolutions that would disgrace unprincipled politicians can be put in a Methodist conference,—resolutions which trample our Discipline in the dust,—and it is all well. If our bishops are not getting into business, I am no prophet. Why have not the northern conferences as good a right to pass their judgment on the *moral character* of slavery, as the southern conferences? Why have not we as good a right to take Discipline ground on this subject as they have to take ground in direct opposition to our general rule? Why have we not as good a right to say slavery is a *sin*, as they have to say our “discussions are mischievous?” Why have we not as good a right to reprove them for enslaving Methodist brothers and sisters, and for making property of God’s image, as they have to “reprove some wrong doings at the North,” which was one of the avowed objects of the resolution? These are grave questions. They involve important principles. If we are to be gagged and made slaves to favor slaveholders, it is time we knew it. If brother Fisk supposes the cry of “The Church! the Church!” will induce us to submit to such things in silence, he is mistaken. While there is any freedom of speech remaining in the church, we shall avail ourselves of the privilege of making known our grievances.

You will perceive that Mr. Capers acknowledged, that, “*if slavery were a moral evil, (that is, sinful) the church would be bound to take cognizance of it.*” The principle, then, on which our southern brethren act, is, that slavery is not a moral evil! Do our northern anti-abolitionists go with them? Rev. Messrs. Fisk, Bangs, Luckey, and the bishops, are identified with this party so far as opposition to abolition is concerned. And I suppose they are to be held, on Br. Fisk’s principle, responsible for the sentiments of the party. The Baltimore, Georgia, and South Carolina Conferences are official organs of anti-abolitionism. And up to this time, the silence of these brethren gives consent to the sentiments and doings of *their party*. Indeed, these sentiments are very similar to some passages in the Counter Appeal.

3\*

In view of all these facts, what judgment is to be formed of the religion of the South? We “judge them not,” though it is said, “by their fruits ye shall know them.” I do not pretend that the M. E. Church is worse than other churches in the south; neither do I believe she is much better. Indeed I have facts now before me to show that there is much more of the spirit and practice of slavery in the Presbyterian, Baptist, and other churches, now, than there was fifty years ago. But my business at present is principally with the M. E. Church. If the “people called Methodists were raised up to spread scriptural holiness over these lands,” they have strangely forgotten their calling in the United States! To *chattelize* God’s intelligent creation, is a poor way to spread scriptural holiness over these lands. The following testimony of a southern gentleman will show the fearful influence of slavery in the southern churches.

*Testimony of the Rev. James Smylie.*

The Rev. James Smylie, A. M., a Presbyterian minister in Mississippi, says, in a pamphlet he has recently published, in favor of American slavery:

“If slavery be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the divine law, and if the *buying, selling, or holding a slave FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN*, is a heinous sin and scandal, then, verily, *THREE FOURTHS OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS, AND PRESBYTERIANS, IN ELEVEN STATES OF THE UNION, are of the devil.* They ‘hold,’ if they do not buy and sell slaves, and, *with few exceptions*, they hesitate not to ‘apprehend and restore’ runaway slaves, when in their power.”

The above is *southern* testimony. It is said, if we admit that slavery is a *sin*, three fourths of all the southern Christians are of the devil! So it must not be a sin, because it will unchurch so many good people! Throw it off upon “Cæsar;” that “is the true doctrine.” Ministers and Christians have nothing to do with it.

## MORAL CONDITION OF THE ENSLAVED.

But let us look at the moral condition of the slaves, and see whether we can get rid of responsibility so easy. And here I will bring my testimony from the slave holding states. It shall come from the fountain head—from men who *know*



something about slavery. Read the following, and blush to own yourselves republicans and Christians.

*Testimony of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.*

The following "facts" are stated in a "Report of a Committee of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, to whom was referred the subject of the Religious Instruction of the colored population, at its late session, in Columbia, S. C., Published by order of the Synod," in the Charleston Observer of March 22, 1834.

"Before we attempt to set forth the duty [to evangelize these heathen] it will be proper to show, that the negroes are destitute of the privileges of the gospel, and ever will be, under the present state of things.

"From long continued and close observation, (say the Synod by their committee,) we believe that their (colored population's) moral and religious condition is such, as that they may justly be considered the heathen of this Christian country, and will bear comparison with heathen in any country in the world.

"In the vast field extending from an entire state beyond the Potomac to the Sabine river; and from the Atlantic to the Ohio, there are, to the best of our knowledge, not twelve men exclusively devoted to the religious instruction of the negroes! \* \* \* The number [two millions of souls, and more] divided between them, would give to each a charge of near 170,000!!

"We can furnish no accurate estimate of the proportion of negroes that attend divine worship on the Sabbath, taking the slave-holding states together. From an extensive observation, however, we venture to say, that not a twentieth part attend! Thousands and thousands hear not the sound of the gospel, or ever enter a church from one year to another.

"We may now inquire if they enjoy the privileges of the gospel, in private, in their own houses, and on their own plantations? Again we return a negative answer. They have no Bibles to read at their own fire-sides—no family altars—and when in affliction, sickness or death, they have no ministers to address to them the consolations of the gospel, nor to bury them with solemn and appropriate services. Sometimes a kind master will perform these offices. If the master is pious, the house servants alone attend family worship, and frequently few or none of these.

"In general, we may however remark, that it does not enter into the arrangement of plantations, to make provision for their religious instruction; and so far as masters are engaged in this work, an almost unbroken silence reigns over the vast field.

"We feel warranted, therefore, in the conclusion, that the negroes are destitute of the privileges of the gospel, and must continue to be so, if nothing more is done for them."

*Testimony of the Rev. C. C. Jones.*

The Rev. C. C. Jones, in a sermon preached before two associations of planters in Georgia, in 1831, says:

"Generally speaking, they (the slaves) appear to us to be without God and without hope in the world. A NATION OF HEATHENS in our very midst. We cannot cry out against the Papist

for withholding the Scriptures from the common people, and keeping them in ignorance of the way of life, for we withhold the Bible from our servants, and keep them in ignorance of it, while we will not use the means to have it read and explained to them. The cry of our perishing servants comes up to us from the sultry plains as they bend at their toil—it comes up from their humble cottages when they return at evening to rest their weary limbs—it comes up to us from the midst of their ignorance, and superstition, and adultery, and lewdness."

*Testimony of the Charleston Observer.*

A writer in a late number of this paper, says: "Let us establish missionaries among our negroes, who, in view of religious knowledge, are as debasingly ignorant as any one on the coast of Africa; for I hazard the assertion, that throughout the bounds of our synod, there are at least one hundred thousand slaves speaking the same language as ourselves, who never HEARD of the plan of salvation by a Redeemer."

The editor in the same paper said, "We fully concur with what our correspondent has said respecting the BENIGHTED HEATHEN among ourselves."

*Testimony of the Western Luminary.*

A writer in the Western Luminary, a respectable religious paper in Lexington, Kentucky, says:

"I proclaim it abroad to the Christian world, that heathenism is as real in the slave States, as it is in the South Sea Islands, and that our negroes are as justly objects of attention to the American and other boards of foreign missions, as the Indians of the western wilds. What is it constitutes heathenism? Is it to be destitute of a knowledge of God—of his holy word—never to have heard scarcely a sentence of it read through life—to know little or nothing of the history, character, instruction and mission of Jesus Christ—to be almost totally devoid of moral knowledge and feeling, of sentiments of probity, truth, and chastity? If this constitutes heathenism, then are there thousands, millions of heathens, in our beloved land. There is one topic to which I will allude, which will serve to establish the heathenism of this population. I allude to the universal licentiousness which prevails. It may be said emphatically that chastity is no virtue among them—that its violation neither injures female character in their own estimation, or that of their master or mistress. No instruction is ever given—no censure pronounced. I speak not of the world; I SPEAK OF CHRISTIAN FAMILIES GENERALLY."

*Testimony of J. A. Thome, of Kentucky.*

"Licentiousness. I shall not speak of the far South, whose sons are fast melting away under the unblushing profligacy which prevails. I allude to the slave-holding West. It is well known that the slave lodgings (I refer now to village slaves) are exposed to the entrance of strangers every hour of the night, and that the sleeping apartments of both sexes are common.

"It is also a fact, that there is no allowed intercourse between the families and servants after the work of the day is over. The family, assembled for the evening, enjoy a conversation elevating and instructive. But the poor slaves are thrust out; no ties of sacred home thrown

around them; no moral instruction to compensate for the toils of the day; no intercourse as of man with man; and should one of the younger members of the family, led by curiosity, steal out into the filthy kitchen, the child is speedily called back, thinking itself happy if it escape an angry rebuke. Why is this? The dread of moral contamination. Most excellent reason; but it reveals a horrid picture. The slaves, cut off from all community of feeling with their masters, roam over the village streets, shocking the ear with their vulgar jestings, and voluptuous songs, or opening their kitchens to the reception of the neighboring blacks, they pass the evening in gambling, dancing, drinking, and the most obscene conversation, kept up until the night is far spent—then crown the scene with indiscriminate debauchery. Where do these things occur? *In the kitchens of church members and elders.*"

*Testimony of the Rev. J. D. Paxton.*

"Some slaves have, indeed, a marriage ceremony performed. It is, however, usually done by one of their own color, and, of course, is not a legal transaction. And if done by a person legally authorized to perform marriages, still it would have no authority, because the law does not recognize marriage among the slaves, so as to clothe it with the rights and immunities which it wears among citizens. The owner of either party might, the next day or hour, break up the connexion in any way he pleased. In fact, the often connexions have no protection, and are so often broken up by sales and transfers and removals, that they are by the slaves often called 'taking up together.' The sense of marriage fidelity must be greatly weakened, if not wholly destroyed, by such a state of things. The effect is most disastrous.

"But there is another circumstance which deserves our notice. What effect is likely to be produced on the morals of the whites, from having about them, and under their absolute authority, female slaves who are deprived of the strongest motives to purity, and exposed to peculiar temptations to opposite conduct! The condition of female slaves is such, that promises and threatenings and management can hardly fail to conquer them. They are entirely dependent on their master. That the vice prevails to a most shameful extent, is proved from the rapid increase of mulattoes. Oh, how many have fallen before this temptation; so many, that it has almost ceased to be a shame to fall! Oh, how many parents may trace the impiety and licentiousness and shame of their prodigal sons, to the temptations found in the female slaves of their own or neighbors' households! Irregular habits are thus formed, which often last through life. And many a lovely and excellent woman, confiding in vows of affection and fidelity, trusting to her power over her devoted lover, has, after uniting her fate with his, and giving him all that woman has to give, found, when too late, how incorrigible are those habits of roving desire, formed in youth, and kept alive by the temptations and facilities of the slave system."

*Testimony of the Rev. John Rankin.*

The Rev. John Rankin has the following, among other statements, on this "delicate subject:"

"Again, slaves, in consequence of the manner

in which they are raised, are generally prone to vicious indulgence, and many of them are exceedingly profligate: their master's children often mingle with them, and not only witness their vicious practices, but also listen to their lascivious conversation, and thus from infancy they become familiar with almost every thing wicked and obscene. And this, in connexion with easy access, becomes a strong temptation to lewdness. Hence it often happens, that the master's children practise the same vices which prevail among his slaves; and even the master himself is liable to be overwhelmed by the floods of temptation. And in some instances the father and his sons are involved in one common ruin; nor do the daughters always escape this impetuous fountain of pollution. Were it necessary, I could refer you to several instances of slaves actually seducing the daughters of their masters! Such seductions sometimes happen even in the most respectable slave-holding families!"

*Testimony of S. A. Forral, Esq.*

"Negresses, when young and likely, are often employed as wet nurses by the white people; as also, by either the planter or his friends, to administer to their sensual desires. This frequently is a matter of speculation; for if the offspring, a mulatto, be a handsome female, 800 or 1000 dollars may be obtained for her in the New Orleans market. It is an occurrence of no uncommon nature, to see a Christian father sell his own daughter, and the brother his own sister, by the same father."

It has been sometimes said that it was a mercy to the negroes to bring them to this country and make slaves of them, in as much as they have been taken from idolatry and brought to this Christian land! But is this a Christian land to them, as a general thing? According to the above extracts there are "two millions or more," among the slaves, "in the condition of heathen, and in some respects in a worse condition." [Yes for many of the heathen are not slaves.] "Not one twentieth part," say the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia, "attend public worship." This is the opinion of a large body of ministers, formed "from an extensive observation" in the midst of slavery! This is bringing them from Africa to make *Christians of them!* Rev. C. C. Jones pronounces the slaves to be "a nation of HEATHEN in our very midst!" Another extract tells us that "there are at least one hundred thousand slaves, speaking the same language as ourselves, who never HEARD of the plan of salvation by a Redeemer!" And they are, it is added, "as debasingly ignorant as any one on the COAST of AFRICA!" We brought them to this country to make *Christians* of them, did we?

And still our southern brethren tell us, they "*will bear comparison with heathen of any country in the world!*" "*Heathenism,*" says the Western Luminary, published in a slave state, "is as real in the *slave states* as in the *South Sea Islands!*" And yet witness the zeal of southern Christians to convert the heathen of foreign nations, while they grind to the dust the ignorant heathen at home! Is not this base hypocrisy? Often does the blood and sweat of the poor ignorant polluted slaves go into the *Missionary box!* And not only so, but their bodies and souls are sometimes sold for the benefit of the church, and the support of missions. Look at this!

AMERICANS SOLD FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CHURCH, AND TO SUPPORT THE CAUSE OF MISSIONS.

In the Charleston Courier of Feb. 12th, 1835, is the following:

FIELD NEGROES, by Thomas Gadsden.

On Tuesday, the 17th instant, will be sold, at the North of the Exchange, at ten o'clock, a prime gang of ten NEGROES, accustomed to the culture of cotton and provisions, belonging to the INDEPENDENT CHURCH, in Christ's Church Parish. \* \* \* \* Feb. 6.

Again—in the Emancipator of May 6, 1834, is the following, copied from a Savannah paper.

"Bryan Superior Court.

Between John J. Maxwell, and others, Executors of Ann Pray, complainants, and Mary Sleigh, and others, Devisees and Legatees, under the will of Ann Pray, defendants. IN EQUITY.

"A Bill, having been filed for the distribution of the estate of the Testatrix, Ann Pray, and it appearing that among other legacies in her will, is the following, viz. a legacy of one fourth of certain negro slaves to the American Board of Commissioners for Domestic [Foreign it probably should have been] Missions for the purpose of sending the gospel to the heathen, and particularly to the Indians of this continent. It is on motion of the solicitors of the complainants ordered, that all persons claiming the said legacy, do appear and answer the bill of the complainants, within four months from this day. And it is ordered, that this order be published in a public Gazette of the city of Savannah, and in one of the Gazettes of Philadelphia, once a month for four months.

"Extract from the minutes, Dec. 3d, 1832. JOHN SMITH, C. S. C. B. C."

Human beings, *Church property*—sold perhaps to pay *Church debts!* Negroes are willed the "*Missionary Society,*" to be converted into cash, to "send the Gospel to the *heathen*, particularly the

*Indians!*" Negroes "*used up,*" soul and body, to convert the Indians? O what heathenism is such conduct! I have been informed, the Missionary Society did not accept this legacy—though they have owned slaves, in several instances. I do not know that they own any now. I have understood that orders had been given by the Board, to the missionaries, to emancipate what remained. Here we see the sentiments and feelings of Southern Christians, in connection with the moral condition of the slaves.

And this business, it would seem, is all a political thing, with which ministers and Christians should not intermeddle! This position is too ridiculous to merit any serious reply. What excellent judges of Christian morals those must be who take this ground! What *conscientious* Christians! Theft and robbery of the worst kind, and grinding God's image to the dust, *all a political thing!* Withholding from two millions of American citizens the Bible and all other books, together with the means of grace, *all a political thing!* O shame, where is thy blush! Putting a million of defenceless females into the hands of unprincipled tyrants, destroying the marriage relation, and breaking up the family state—*all a political thing!* But this is a very delicate question—"wholly refrain!" And for slave holding, which lays the foundation for all these horrid abominations, Northern ministers will apologize, and in defence of it, write Bible arguments! And even a bishop will bring in the Golden Rule to justify certain slave holders!! Sooner may my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, and my right hand drop from my body, than that I should ever be left to do such a thing. No apology for slavery in any case can be made, without strengthening the whole system. And how awful the reflection, that good men will undesignedly give their influence to this bloody Moloch. I would a thousand times rather apologize for *horse stealers* than *men stealers*. I would much sooner defend drunkenness under "certain circumstances," than slavery.

It may be said, that the moral condition of the slaves, in the preceding pages, is too highly colored. If so, it is by southern men—ministers of the Gospel; many of whom were slave holders! But

what inducement should they have to make slavery worse than it is? It is admitted, that a portion of the slaves have some religious instruction. There are 70,000 slaves in the M. E. Church. Suppose there are as many in our congregations, we should then have 140,000 (generally without Bibles,) who have some religious instruction. Suppose there are as many connected with other churches and congregations in proportion to their number. The whole number, after the most liberal calculation, will be found to be less than 500,000; which would leave four times that amount, or about 2,000,000, in total darkness and heathenism! The probability however is, that not more than 250,000, or about one in ten, enjoy the blessings of religious instructions at all. The Synod of South Carolina and Georgia say, "not more than *one in twenty* attend divine service! And they certainly know better than we in the North. Now what a horrid picture is this? Are we not much worse than the Roman Catholics? They only withhold the Bible from their people,—but we withhold all knowledge of letters from the slaves! And yet the phlegmatic Northern divine can look upon this awful state of things with indifference; or perhaps sneeringly talk about "raw-head and bloody bones!"

Mr. Birney, in his Letter to the Churches gives it as his opinion, that out of 200,000 colored people in Kentucky, which is one of the mildest slave States, there are not one in forty who are receiving elementary instruction in reading, from all private efforts and Sabbath schools together—not one in eighty who can read the Bible understandingly and with ease—not one in two hundred who can write a hand sufficiently legible for the transaction of the plainest business—not one in 2000 who have a competent knowledge of arithmetic as far as the rule of three; and he adds, "I know not *one*, either personally or from information, who can read, write and cypher." He admits there may be such an instance; but if there is, he knows it not. And yet there are no laws to prevent the education of the slaves in Kentucky! And if such be the facts in this State, what must be the mental and moral condition of the slaves in those States where the whole civil authority is pledged

ed to keep them in ignorance, as is the case generally in the slave States? Mr. Birney was formerly a resident of Mercer county, Ky.—some time a Colonization agent, and all his life a slave holder till within three or four years. He has had, therefore, a good opportunity to understand this "delicate subject" in all its bearings.

In addition to the foregoing testimonies touching the moral and mental condition of the slaves, permit me to lay before you a few extracts from "An Address to the Presbyterians of Kentucky, proposing a plan for the instruction and emancipation of their slaves, by a Committee of the Synod of Kentucky."

It was requested by the committee, that this address should be read by all the Presbyterian ministers in Kentucky, to their congregations respectively, on the Sabbath. I have made large extracts from this valuable and very able document, and wish my limits would permit me to insert the whole. Most of those who will read this appeal have never seen that address. While you read these extracts, brethren, please bear in mind two things. 1. That this document was put forth in a *slave State*, and addressed to *slave holders*. And, 2dly, That it is a description of slavery in its *mildest form*. The authors of this address, be it remembered, knew all about slavery. After an introduction, they proceed as follows:

"We earnestly entreat you, brethren, to receive our communication in the same spirit of kindness, in which it is made; and permit neither prejudice nor interest to close your minds against the reception of truth, or steel your hearts against the convictions of conscience. Very soon it will be a matter of no moment whether we have had large or small possessions on the earth; but it will be of infinite importance whether or not we have conscientiously sought out the will of God and done it.

"We all admit that the system of slavery, which exists among us, is not right. Why, then, do we assist in perpetuating it? Why do we make no serious efforts to terminate it? Is it not because our perception of its sinfulness is very feeble and indistinct, while our perception of the difficulties of instructing and emancipating our slaves is strong and clear? As long as we believe that slavery, as it exists among us, is a *light evil* in the sight of God, so long will we feel inclined to pronounce every plan that can be devised for its termination, inexpedient or impracticable. Before, then, we unfold our plan, we wish to examine the system, and try it by the principles which religion teaches.

## WHAT SLAVERY IS.

"Slavery is not the same all the world over. The system as it exists among us, and is constituted by our laws, *consists of three distinct parts—a deprivation of the right of property, a deprivation of personal liberty, and a deprivation of personal security.* In all its parts it is, manifestly, a violation of the laws of God, as revealed by the light of nature, as well as the light of revelation.

## DEPRIVES OF THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY.

"1st. *A part of our system of slavery consists in depriving human beings of the right to acquire and hold property.* Does it need any proof to show that God has given to all human beings a right to the proceeds of their own labor? The heathen acknowledge it—every man feels it. The Bible is full of denunciations against those who withhold from others the fruits of their exertions. 'Wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work.' Does an act which is wrong, when done once and toward one individual, become right because it is practised daily and hourly, and to-wards thousands?—Does the just and holy One frown the less upon injustice, because it is systematically practised, and is sanctioned by the laws of the land? No: we all recognize the principle, that the laws of the God of nature can never be replaced by any legislature under heaven.—These laws will endure, when the statutes of earth shall have crumbled with the parchments on which they are enrolled—and by these laws we know that we must be judged, in the day in which the destinies of our souls shall be determined.

## DEPRIVATION OF PERSONAL LIBERTY.

"2d. *The deprivation of personal liberty forms another part of our system of slavery.*—Not only has the slave no right to his wife and children, he has no right even to himself. His very body, his muscles, his bones, his flesh, are all the property of another. The movements of his limbs are regulated by the will of a master. He may be sold, like a beast of the field—he may be transported, in chains, like a felon. Was the blood of our Revolution shed to establish a false principle, when it was poured out in defence of the assertion, that "all men are created equal;" that "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?" If it be a violation of the rights of nature to deprive men of their *political freedom*, the injustice is surely much more flagrant when we rob them of *personal liberty*. The condition of a subject is enviable compared with the condition of a slave.

"Still further, the deprivation of personal liberty is so complete that it destroys the right of conscience. Our system, as established by law, arms the master with power to prevent his slave from worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The owner of human beings among us may legally restrain them from assembling to hear the instructions of divine truth, or even from ever uniting

their hearts and voices in social prayer and praise to Him who created them. God alone is Lord over the conscience. Yet our system, defrauding alike our Creator and our slaves, confers upon men this prerogative of Deity.—Argument is unnecessary, to show the guilt and madness of such a system. And do we not participate in its criminality, if we uphold it?

## DEPRIVATION OF PERSONAL SECURITY.

"3d. *The deprivation of personal security is the remaining constituent of our system of slavery.* The life of a bondman cannot be taken with impunity. But the law extends its protection no further. Cruelty may be carried to any extent, provided life be spared. Mangling, imprisonment, starvation, every species of torture may be inflicted upon him, and he has no redress. But not content with thus laying the body of the slave defenceless at the foot of the master, our system proceeds still further, and strips him in a great measure of all protection against the inhumanity of any other white man who may choose to maltreat him. The laws prohibit the evidence of a slave against a white man from being received in a court of justice. So that wantonness and cruelty may be exercised by any man with impunity, upon these unfortunate people, provided none witness it but those of their own color. In describing such a condition, we may well adopt the language of sacred writ: 'Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter. And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment.'

"Such is the essential character of our slavery. Without any crime on the part of its unfortunate subjects, they are deprived for life, and their posterity after them, of the right to property, of the right to liberty, and of the right to personal security. These odious features are not the excrescences upon the system—they are *the system itself*—they are its essential constituent parts. And can any man believe that such a thing as this is not sinful—that it is not hated by God—and ought not to be abhorred and abolished by man?

## EFFECTS OF SLAVERY.

"But there are certain *effects*, springing naturally and necessarily out of such a system, which must also be considered in forming a proper estimate of its character.

## DEPRAVES AND DEGRADES ITS SUBJECTS.

"1. Its most striking effect is, *to deprave and degrade its subjects by removing from them the strongest natural check to human corruption.* Character, property, destination, power, and family respectability, are all withdrawn from the reach of the slave. No object is presented to excite and cultivate those higher feelings, whose exercises would repress his passions and regulate his appetites. Thus slavery deranges and ruins the moral machinery of man—it cuts the sinews of the soul—it extracts from human nature the salt that purifies and preserves it, and leaves it a corrupting mass of appetite and passion.

### IGNORANCE OF THE SLAVES.

"2. *It dooms thousands of human beings to hopeless ignorance.* The impression is almost universal, that intellectual elevation unfits men for servitude, and renders it impossible to retain them in this condition. This impression is unquestionably correct. The weakness and ignorance of their victims is the only safe foundation on which injustice and oppression can rest. We may as soon expect to fether the winds, seal up the clouds, or extinguish the fires of the volcano, as to prevent enlightened minds from recovering their natural condition of freedom. Hence, in some of our states, laws have been enacted, prohibiting, under severe penalties, the instruction of the blacks; and even where such laws do not exist, there are formidable numbers who oppose, with deep hostility, every effort to enlighten the mind of the negro. These men are determined that slavery shall be perpetuated; and they know that their universal education must be followed by their universal emancipation. How horrible must be that system, which, in the opinion of even its strongest advocates, demands as the necessary condition of its existence, that knowledge should be shut out from the minds of those who live under it—that they should be reduced as nearly as possible to the level of brutes or living machines—that the powers of their souls should be crushed! Let each one of us ask, can such a system be aided or even tolerated without deep criminality?

### DEPRIVED OF THE GOSPEL.

"3. *It deprives its subjects, in a great measure, of the privileges of the gospel.* The privileges of the gospel, as enjoyed by the white population in this land, consist in *free access to the scriptures, a regular gospel ministry, and domestic means of grace.* Neither of these is, to any extent worth naming, enjoyed by slaves, as a moment's consideration will satisfactorily show. The law, as it is here, does not prevent *free access to the scriptures*—but ignorance, the natural result of their condition, does. The Bible is before them, but it is to them a sealed book. 'The light shineth in the darkness, but the darkness comprehendeth it not.'

"It has been proposed by some zealous and devoted friends of the colored race, to supply the deficiency of gospel ministrations among them, by the employment of suitable missionaries, who may labor exclusively among them. We need not here speculate on the probable results of such a scheme if carried into effect, in a community where there is no intention to emancipate; for before there is found among us benevolence enough to adopt and execute it, on a scale large enough to effect any highly valuable purpose, the community will be already ripe for measures of emancipation. Such a spirit of kindness towards this unfortunate race as this scheme pre-supposes, can never co-exist with a determination to keep them in *hopeless bondage*. Further, there are no houses of worship exclusively devoted to the colored population. The galleries of our own churches, which are set apart to their use, would not hold the tenth part of their numbers—and even these few seats are, in general, thinly occupied. So that, as a body, it is evident that our slaves do not enjoy the public ordinances of religion.

*Domestic means of grace* are still more rare among them."

### CRUELTY OF THE SYSTEM.

"4. *This system licenses and produces great cruelty.* The law places the whip in the hands of the master, and its use, provided he avoid destroying life, is limited only by his own pleasure. There are, in our land, hundreds of thousands clothed with arbitrary powers over those, whom they are educated to regard as their property, as instruments of their will, as creatures beneath their sympathy, devoid of all the feelings which dignify humanity, and but one remove above cattle. Is it not certain that many of these hundreds of thousands will inflict outrages on their despised dependants?—There are now, in our whole land, two millions of human beings, exposed, defenceless, to every insult and every injury short of maiming or death, which their fellow men may choose to inflict. They suffer all that can be inflicted by wanton caprice, by grasping avarice, by brutal lust, by malignant spite, and by insane anger. Their happiness is the sport of every whim, and the prey of every passion, that may, occasionally, or habitually, intest the master's bosom. If we could calculate the amount of woe endured by ill-treated slaves, it would overwhelm every compassionate heart, it would move even the obdurate to sympathy.

Brutal stripes, and all the varied kinds of personal indignities, are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses. The law does not recognize the family relations of a slave, and extends to him no protection in the enjoyment of domestic endearments. The members of a slave family may be forcibly separated, so that they shall never more meet until the final judgment. And cupidity often induces the masters to practise what the law allows.—Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives, are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us. The shrieks and the agony often witnessed on such occasions, proclaim with a trumpet tongue the iniquity and cruelty of our system. The cry of these sufferers goes up to the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. There is not a neighborhood where these heart-rending scenes are not displayed. There is not a village or road that does not behold the sad procession of manacled outcasts, whose chains and mournful countenances tell that they are exiled by force from all that their hearts held dear. Our churches cannot be entirely pure, even from the grossest pollutions of slavery, *until we are willing to pledge ourselves to the destruction of the whole system.*

### LICENTIOUSNESS OF THE SLAVES.

"5. *It produces general licentiousness among the slaves.* Marriage, as a civil ordinance, they cannot enjoy. Our laws do not recognize this relation as existing among them; and, of course, do not enforce by any sanction, the observance of its duties. Indeed, until slavery 'waxeth old and tendeth to decay,' there cannot be any legal recognition of the marriage rite, or the enforcement of the consequent duties. For all regulations on this subject would limit the master's absolute right of property in

his slaves. In his disposal of them, he would no longer be at liberty to consult merely his own interest. He could no longer separate the wife and husband to suit the convenience or interest of the purchaser, no matter how advantageous might be the terms offered. And as the wife and husband do not always belong to the same owner, and are not often wanted by the same purchaser, their duties to each other would thus, if enforced by law, frequently conflict with the interests of the master. Hence, all the marriage that could ever be allowed to them would be a mere contract, voidable at the master's pleasure. Their present quasi marriages are just such contracts, and are continually thus voided. Many of them are united without even the sham and forceless ceremony which is sometimes used. This wretched system of concubinage inevitably produces revolting licentiousness. Can this system be tolerated without sin?

#### DEMORALIZING TO THE WHITES.

"6. *This system demoralizes the white, as well as the blacks.* Masters are, in a great degree, irresponsible for the exercise of their power; and they generally feel that their object in possessing and exercising their dominion is their own utility, and not the good of those over whom they rule. The hand of one of our greatest statesmen has strikingly portrayed the demoralizing effects of this system on the minds and manners of the ruling class. 'There must doubtless,' says Mr. Jefferson, 'be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions—the most unrelenting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive either in his philanthropy or his self love, for restraining the intemperance of passion toward his slave, it should always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But, generally, it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs, in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose to the worst of passions, and, thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances.' Such, according to the testimony of one who had marked its operation with a philosopher's eye, is the character which slavery forms—a character perfectly the reverse of that which the Gospel requires."

#### THE VENGEANCE OF GOD.

"7. *This system draws down upon us the vengeance of Heaven.* 'God is just,' and 'he will render to every one according to his works.' Oppression can never escape unpunished, while He who hath emphatically declared that He is the 'Judge of the widow,' and 'the Father of the fatherless,' is on the throne of the universe.

"Not a sparrow falls to the ground, we are told, without the notice of God: how much more doth he mark the abuse and oppression of a creature who bears his own peculiar image! 'The very hairs of our head are all numbered;' much more are the groanings of the oppressed and the sighings of the prisoner recorded by Him who says that his 'ear is ever open to the cry of the poor and needy.' The sore cry of millions of the down-trodden has gone up to Heaven from the midst of us; this cry is still swelling upward, and if there be righteousness on the throne of the universe, it must bring down vials of wrath upon the heads of all who are engaged in this guilty work.

"Brethren, we profess to be Christians; we reverence the holy revelation which God has given; we look to its precepts for guidance, and to its denunciations for warnings. We know that the principles of the divine dealings are the same in every age, and that what God said to those of old, when we are in similar circumstances, he saith unto us. Listen, then, to one of the many intimations he has given us of the way in which he will punish it. 'The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy; yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully, and I sought for a man among them that should stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it; but I found none. Therefore have I poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath; their own way have I recompensed upon their heads, saith the Lord.' Can we despise the instructions of the Almighty? Shall we shut our eyes and close our ears against the admonitions of the great Judge of the earth? Shall we not arise, and 'stand in the gap before him for the land, that he may not destroy it?' Though our 'nest may be built on high,' and 'our defence be the munitions of rocks,' we cannot escape, if God rise up against us: He can blast our prosperity; He can drown us in blood; He can blot out our existence and our name from under heaven.

"We have now exhibited, fairly, but briefly, the nature and effects of slavery. For the truth of our facts, we refer to your own observations; for the correctness of our reasoning, we appeal to your judgments and consciences. What, then, must we conclude? Is slavery a system which Christians should sanction, or even tolerate, if their efforts can avail to abolish it?"

A short extract from this address, touching the Bible argument, I shall insert in another place.

After recommending a thorough course of instruction, mental and moral, in connection with kind treatment, the committee propose a plan of *gradual emancipation*, somewhat similar to that contained in the Methodist Discipline in 1801. But Kentucky will set every slave in the State free within five years—"mark that." Perhaps within three years. She is now inviting the discussion of slavery in the newspapers. She

will come out on the "plan" of immediateism, soon.

The address closes as follows :

#### CONCLUSION.

"Brethren, there are three courses before you, one of which you must choose—either to emancipate immediately and without preparation, or to pursue some such plan of gradual emancipation as we propose, or to continue to lend your example and influence to perpetuate slavery. It is improbable that you will adopt the first course: if, then, you refuse to concur in the plan of gradual emancipation, and act upon it, however you may lull conscience, you are lending your aid to perpetuate a demoralizing and cruel system, which it would be an insult to God to imagine that he does not abhor—a system which exhibits power without responsibility, toil without recompense, life without liberty, law without justice, wrongs without redress, infamy without crime, punishment without guilt, and families without marriage—a system which will not only make victims of the present unhappy generation, inflicting upon them the degradation, the contempt, the lassitude and the anguish of hopeless oppression, but which even aims at transmitting this heritage of injury and woe to their children, and their children's children, down to their latest posterity. Can any Christian contemplate, without trembling, his own agency in the perpetuation of such a system? And what will be the end of these scenes of misery and vice? Shall we wait until worldly politicians and legislators may rise up and bid them cease? We will wait in vain. Already have we heard the sentiment proclaimed from high places, and by the voice of authority, that a race of slaves is necessary to the existence of freedom. Is it from those who utter such sentiments that we expect deliverance to come? No. Reformation must commence where we are divinely taught that 'judgment must begin—at the house of God.' This work must be done; and Christians must begin it, and begin it soon, or wrath will come upon us. The groans of millions do not rise for ever unheard before the throne of the Almighty. The hour of doom must soon arrive—the storm must soon gather—the bolt of destruction must soon be hurled—and the guilty must soon be dashed in pieces. The voice of past history, and the voice of inspiration, both warn us that the catastrophe must come, unless averted by repentance. And let us remember that we are each of us individually responsible. We are individually assisting to pile up this mountain of guilt. The sophistry and false reasoning by which we may delude our own souls, will not blind the eyes which 'are as a flame of fire.' A few years, at most, will place us where we would gladly give all the slaves of a universe, to buy off the punishment that oppression brings down upon the soul. It may be difficult to do our duty; but it will be far more difficult to stand in the judgment without having done it.

"Brethren, we have done. The hour is coming, in which the slave and his master must stand together before the tribunal of God—a God who judges righteously. Are you prepared to place yourselves before him who will decide upon your eternal destiny, and say that you

have done justice to those whom you now hold in bondage? Are you prepared to say, 'As I have done unto these, so let it be done unto me—as I have showed mercy, so let me receive mercy at the hands of my Judge?' Anticipate, we beseech you, the feelings and decision of that great day which is fast hastening on—try yourselves now, as God will then try you. 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God?' Are you 'doing justly,' while you retain your fellow-men in hopeless bondage? Are you 'loving mercy,' while you are supporting a system that degrades and brutalizes beings whom God created in his own image? These are solemn questions. Let reason answer them; and let conscience decide your future course.

JOHN BROWN, *Chairman.*

"JOHN C. YOUNG, *Secretary.*"

How unlike are the foregoing sentiments to the sentiments expressed at our last General Conference. Here we see Presbyterian ministers in a slave holding State standing almost as erect as the abolitionists, while we see a General Conference of Methodist ministers bowing and crouching to slavery! And a large majority of this General Conference were from the *free States*! In no manner could they be prevailed upon to express any sentiment against slavery. And yet they must not be called pro-slavery. O no: But when I refuse to express a sentiment against slavery, *every where*, I will give any person leave to post me as a *pro-slavery man* all over the world. That would be my *appropriate name*.

I verily believe there is a *worse kind* of anti-abolition in the North, than in the South. A slave holder can, in most cases, *feel the force of an argument*—but many of our Northern opponents either *cannot* or *will not*. State facts about slavery to a slave holder, and he feels their force—state them to an anti-abolitionist in the North, and he will not believe. No matter how well they are authenticated, he *will not* believe them. And yet he is ready to believe any thing from slave holders. Brethren, what do you think of *such a spirit*? We ask our opponents to read—but no, they know all about the subject now. Abolitionism is not right, it *cannot* be right, it *shall not* be right.

I gave a copy of Gerrit Smith's able and candid Letter to Mr. Smylie, to a Presiding Elder not many months ago; but he threw it on the floor with disdain! Another Presiding Elder at the



same time, a member of the same Conference, refused to take a copy. Several other brethren also refused. They are wiser, I presume, in their own eyes, than seven men who can render a reason. But is this prejudice right? Ought we not to be more candid and open to conviction? I am happy, however, to say, that this is not the character of all our opponents. There are some "honorable exceptions." Some brethren conscientiously doubt the propriety of our course, who are nevertheless open to conviction, and are willing to read. And where brethren will inform themselves, we have no fears about the result. If they do not like our measures, let them adopt better ones; but in the name of bleeding humanity let them not stand all the day idle. Let them turn a part of their weapons from opposing the friends of the slave, to opposing *slavery*.

#### SLAVERY IN GEORGIA.

The writer of the following letters is *now* and has been for many years a useful member of the New-England Conference. I am intimately acquainted with him, and the utmost confidence may be placed in his statements. He was about five years in a slave State, and states what he has seen. These letters have been published in *Zion's Watchman*.

"WALES, MASS. Feb. 14, 1836.

"*Dear Br. Sunderland*—I know somewhat of that heart-sickening system, *Slavery*, as it exists in the South, and especially up and down the Savannah river. Most of the time for five years, I was in the midst of it—and often saw scenes of horror which would make my blood run cold in my veins. Frequently at the piteous groans of the slave, under the lash of his master, or the slave driver, or the constable, have I run away, that the sound might die away upon my ears; *often have I heard the slave cry to God for help under the lash.*

"The whipping system, as practised at the South, is more cruel than death. The most moderate kind of whipping with which I was acquainted when there, was thirty-nine lashes on the bare back, 'well laid on'—and this cut up the back in a horrible manner. I do not mean that no one was ever whipped with less than thirty-nine lashes, but I mean for most offences worthy of the notice of the master or driver, or of the lash, thirty-nine was considered but a moderate flogging; but how many, horrible to relate, have tied up their slaves and whipped them until out of breath—and when a little rested would commence again and whip, until they had beat them quite, or almost to death. For the small offence of taking a little wood, from a master's yard, which cost twelve and a

half cents in the city, I have known a negro to be stripped and receive a hundred lashes. I have been on several plantations, and for a short time had negroes under my care on the plantations, and if they did not do their task in season, or if any one complained of being sick, that the master thought was a doubtful case, he would be condemned to the lash.

"Often have the owners wanted to have me whip their slaves, and always gave me full liberty to whip them—a task, however, I never performed. A negro barber shaved me on Sabbath morn; the next Sabbath he was a corpse, having been whipped and beat to death by his master. On one plantation where I labored, the master was known to be up and whipping his slaves before 2 o'clock, A. M., and the same man would blow his horn to have his slaves rise and go to work, and then himself go to bed again. When they run away, they are hunted down in the swamps, with dogs which are trained up for the purpose. Their clothing is of the poorest kind—of which they have two suits per year. Their shoes, which are made here at the North, (and shame to them who make them,) many of them at least, will come to pieces in four weeks. Their food, or *feed*, generally speaking, is of the poorest kind. One peck of corn for each negro per week, is, I think, all that the laws of Georgia allow their slaves, or the amount of one peck in sweet potatoes or in rice—and you may depend many give them no more. And corn in the South is worth only from 30 to 50 cents per bushel. This is all that many received to my knowledge, with a little salt, however; and this they are permitted to come to but once in a day,—and farther, they have to grind or pound their own corn, and then have about one hour or one and a half to mix it with water, fling it on the coals that it may heat and smoke through, and by the time they can swallow it down the horn blows for every man to be at his post again. I am now speaking of those plantations where I am acquainted. Occasionally, however, some of the masters would send to market and buy a beef's head for his slaves, especially if they had worked harder than usual. Some would sell their peck of corn for rum, and then they would have to live through the week by begging. But few know, here at the North, how much the poor slaves suffer for the want of the necessities of life. Some masters, however, do better by them—but as a general thing, on the plantations, they suffer extremely for the want of food, raiment and good treatment. Sundays, as a general thing, are holidays with the slaves. I know some of them are under the influence of the Gospel, but the greatest part are not. Within twenty or thirty miles from the city of Savannah, the slaves come swarming into the city on the Sabbath, some with a bundle of wood upon their heads, others with a little wild game, others with their weekly allowance of corn, rice or potatoes, and thus they throng the markets and stores (for thus they do in Savannah) on this holy day, to get a little rum, tobacco, &c., to carry back on their plantations.

"On the plantations generally, males and females work in the field; many of them in warm weather with no other clothing on than a little piece of cloth girt about their waist. It is no new thing to see a little black infant, not more

than four or five weeks old, wallowing in the sand and dirt, and the mother at the same time digging with her hoe close by. The masters being so unfeeling to the cries of sick mothers, the mothers seem to be rather unfeeling to the cries of their infants, else they fear the lash, which they know will be applied if they do not perform their task. The above description may not be the case with all Christian masters, but God knows, and the South know, that their treatment is a system of horrible cruelty and oppression. Their neglect of the old negroes who are worn out, and the separating of man and wife, and children, are truly heart rending.

"The visitor on the plantation knows but little of those scenes of horror, which are committed at the whipping-post. I could write much more, but must close. Yours affectionately,

"HORACE MOULTON."

"My heart sickens while I look back upon those scenes of horror which I experienced when at the South, where for the space of almost five years, I saw the poor slaves abused, whipped, and half starved. In Georgia, you know, the planters give each slave only one peck of their gourd-seed per week, with a small quantity of salt. This they must grind in a hand-mill after they have done their tasks at night. They commence working early in the morning and work until about 11 o'clock, A.M. and then they prepare their homminy and salt, or baked or smoked dough, swallow it down, and go to their work again; and eat no more until their task is done—neither do they eat any more than one regular meal per day.

"Now think of your abundance, and then think of their scanty pittance. Think of your own houses, and then think of their huts without chimneys or boards or floors. Think of your good beds, then of their straw and rugs. Think of your fine apparel, then of their half naked bodies. Think of the supplies granted to your children when they cry for bread, and then think of the poor black children, without milk, without meat, with but a scanty portion of smoked homminy or cake. And, finally, think of the care taken of you when sick, then think of them in their smoky cabins almost neglected. I can hardly feed my child without thinking of those poor suffering black children, which endure such hardships. We have Bibles to read, they have none. We can train up our little ones for God—the blacks cannot. We can govern our own children—they cannot. We can administer to ours when sick and dying—they frequently cannot.

"The system of slavery, so far as my knowledge extends, is a horrible system of misery in all its bearings. The laws do not protect the black woman from the gross insults of the white villain. They do not allow a black person to strike a white one in self-defence under any circumstances; neither do the laws of Georgia protect the poor innocent blacks from the guards and patrols, if found from home after eight o'clock, P. M. without a pass from their master. This you have from an eye-witness.

"HORACE MOULTON.

"East Granville, Mass. Nov. 17, 1836."

The following is an extract from a letter addressed to me, and dated Vir-

ginia, Dec. 8, 1836. The writer is a member of the M. E. Church. He is now in New England. I knew him both before and since he lived in Virginia. He is esteemed and beloved by those who know him.

"Since I have come into Virginia, I have encountered four or five droves of human beings on their way to market in Mississippi, comprising about as many hundreds. They were bought up by traders in Maryland and the northern parts of Virginia, and were driven on foot and in chains, to linger out a miserable existence, and find a premature grave among strangers. Many of them were torn away from their wives and children, and all were separated, no doubt, from friends more or less immediately related and endeared.

"While passing through Fauquier county, a drove of about thirty came along, every one chained. When they first came in sight, they presented so striking a resemblance to a picture I used to see on one of the anti-slavery works among you, that I was immediately reminded of it—the tallest going before, and the shorter following in regular succession."

#### EXTRACTS OF LETTERS FROM THE SOUTH.

The following are extracts from letters directed to me, *now* in my possession, written by a *Methodist preacher* in one of the slave States, in 1835–6. I am well acquainted with the writer. He was formerly a member of one of the Conferences in New England. Full faith may be placed in his testimony. He states some facts respecting slavery, and gives us also his views of abolitionism.

Look at the astounding fact, that one reason why Methodist preachers are so popular, is, *they stick so close to slavery.*

*Extract of a letter, dated March 13, 1835.*

"As to the horrors of slavery, they are many every way. First, the slave trade is the *most horrible* of all. Indeed, this comprises the whole in miniature. The slave dealer goes to Virginia or to Maryland, where negroes are numerous and not very profitable, and where they are cheap, and transports them to the Southwest, and sells them for an advance of fifty per cent. Here wives and husbands, parents and children, brothers and sisters, are separated!—a business no better than the *African* slave trade. If any of them are refractory and at all dangerous to the '*speculator*,' he is put in irons, and besides humbled by a severe scourging,—perhaps with a THOUSAND LASHES! *till he is but a little above being dead!*

"There are many vices, which are winked at by the good, and encouraged by the un-

golly, who hold slaves. I allude to breeding slaves. There is a great temptation to this. No property can be vested more profitably than in young healthy negro women. They will, by breeding, double in every five or six years. Mulattoes are surer than pure negroes. Hence planters have no objections to any white man or boy having free intercourse with all the females!—and it has been the case, that an overseer has been encouraged to make the whole *posse* his harem; and has been *paid* for the issue! This causes a general corruption of morals.”

*Extract of a letter dated Nov. 25, 1835.*

“On the subject of slavery, you have my opinion, and in regard to *abolition* too. I fully believe in the doctrine you have espoused, and believe with you that it will ultimately triumph. Interest is the great lever which moves or retards every wheel, and the South is too much interested in the continuance of slavery, to *hear any thing on the subject*. The preachers of the Gospel are in the same condemnation, and *Methodist preachers especially*. The principal reason why the Methodists in these regions are more numerous and popular than other denominations is, *they stick so closely to slavery*. They denounce both the abolitionists and the colonizationists. What then do they want? You can easily see. I think some of you would be inclined to answer Bishops Emory and Hedding’s Address. If I were in your shoes, I would do it. When I saw it, I expected it would be answered; but have heard nothing.”

*Extract of a letter, dated March 5, 1836.*

“I have just received your letter of the 19th of February. I see by that, you still hold on upon the *old peg*. Steer well, and all will be well. The principles you have espoused, I believe are such as all who are candid, honest and

intelligent men, even in the South, believe to be correct in the abstract. Now the thing is, to make them *practical*. This is what you are about, it seems. I believe your cause will experience a ‘triumph’ in the North, and, ere long, in the South. But I fear I shall not live to see it.”

*Extract of a letter, dated June 27, 1836.*

“You can have no idea of the state of feeling that exists in the South on the abolition question. A Northern man must avow his sentiments against the abolitionists, or he will be suspected;—and even if he does, and yet is not violent like the Southerners, he will be suspected of hypocrisy. **THE WHOLE SOUTH TREMBLES!** The preachers and people all, at the North, to use their own words, ‘are rotten at heart on the subject.’ That is, they are all abolitionists, though they do not like to say so. Let Congress be petitioned, till a law is passed making it a *penal crime* to buy or sell a man, woman or child in the United States; and then the work is done. The different States may be left to take such a course with the negro population as they please. I will assure you, the slaves will be freed, as fast as it will be either good for them or safe for the country, if buying and selling were a crime. Those who now have them would soon be burdened with them, they breed so rapidly; and those who have none, *would not have any*. Let Congress do nothing more than to say it shall be a penal crime against the United States to buy or sell human beings within the limits of the United States, after a given date; and there will be a *tremendous movement* in all the Southern States. There might be *nullification*, perhaps, and perhaps a division of the States. But I doubt whether all the noise in the South would not terminate in *smoke!*”

## PART II.—BIBLE ARGUMENT.

As the Bible has been claimed to be a pro-slavery book, both in the North and South, it is proper to present in this Appeal, at least an outline of what is called the Bible Argument. A mere skeleton is all my limits will allow. The following extracts are from the unanswered argument of THEODORE D. WELD, Esq. on the Old Testament; from Rev. L. R. SUNDERLAND'S Anti-Slavery Manual; and from the Address of the Committee of the Synod of Kentucky. To these extracts, I shall append some remarks.

"The spirit of slavery never takes refuge in the Bible of its own accord. The horns of the altar are its last resort. It seizes them, if at all, only in desperation,—rushing from the terror of the avenger's arm. Like other unclean spirits, it 'hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest its deeds should be reproved.' Goaded to phrenzy in its conflicts with conscience and common sense, denied all quarter, and hunted from every covert, it breaks at last into the sacred enclosure, and courses up and down the Bible, 'seeking rest, and finding none.' THE LAW OF LOVE, streaming from every page, flashes around it an omnipresent anguish and despair. It shrinks from the hated light, and howls under the consuming touch, as demons recoiled from the Son of God, and shrieked, 'Torment us not.' At last it slinks away among the shadows of the Mosaic system, and thinks to burrow out of sight among its types and shadows. Vain hope! Its asylum is its sepulchre; its city of refuge, the city of destruction. It rushes from light into the sun; from heat, into devouring fire; and from the voice of God into the thickest of His thunders.

## DEFINITION OF SLAVERY.

"If we would know whether the Bible is the charter of slavery, we must first determine *just what slavery is*. The thing itself must be separated from its appendages. A constituent element is one thing; a relation another; an appendage another. Relations and appendages presuppose *other* things, of which there are relations and appendages. To regard them as *the things* to which they pertain, or as constituent parts of them, leads to endless fallacies. A great variety of conditions, relations, and tenures, indispensable to the social state, are confounded with slavery; and thus slave holding is deemed quite harmless, if not virtuous. We will specify some of the things which are often confounded with slavery.

"1. *Privation of the right of suffrage*. Then minors are slaves.

"2. *Ineligibility to office*. Then females are slaves.

"3. *Taxation without representation*. Then

three fourths of the people of Rhode Island are slaves, and *all* in the District of Columbia.

"4. *Privation of one's oath in law*. Then the free colored people of Ohio are slaves, so are disbelievers in a future retribution, generally.

"5. *Privation of trial by jury*. Then all in France and Germany are slaves.

"6. *Being required to support a particular religion*. Then the people of England are slaves. [To the preceding may be added all other disabilities, merely political.]

"7. *Cruelty and oppression*. Wives are often cruelly treated; hired domestics are often oppressed; but these forms of oppression are not slavery.

"8. *Apprenticeship*. The rights and duties of master and apprentice are correlative and reciprocal. The *claim* of each upon the other results from the *obligation* of each to the other. Apprenticeship is based on the principle of equivalent for value received. The rights of the apprentice are secured, and his interests are promoted equally with those of the master. Indeed, while the law of apprenticeship is *just* to the master, it is *benevolent* to the apprentice. Its main design is rather to benefit the apprentice than the master. It *promotes* the interests of the former, while it guards from injury those of the latter in securing it. It secures to the master a mere legal compensation, while it secures to the apprentice both a legal compensation, and a virtual gratuity in addition, the apprentice being of the two decidedly the greatest gainer. The law not only recognizes the *right* of the apprentice to a reward for his labor, but appoints the wages, and enforces the payment. The master's claim covers only the *services* of the apprentice. The apprentice's claim covers *equally* the services of the master. The master cannot hold the apprentice as property, nor the apprentice the master; but each holds property in the services of the other, and BOTH EQUALLY. Is this slavery?

"9. *Filial subordination and parental claims*. Both are nature's dictates, and indispensable to the existence of the social state; their *design* the promotion of mutual welfare; and the *means*, those natural affections created by the relation of parent and child, and blending them in one by irrepressible affinities; and thus, while exciting each to discharge those offices incidental to the relation, they constitute a shield for mutual protection. The parent's legal claim to the services of his children, while minors, is a slight boon for the care and toil of their rearing, say nothing of outlays for support and education. This provision for the good of the *whole*, is, with the greater part of mankind, indispensable to the preservation of the family state. The child, in helping his parents, helps himself,—increases a common stock, in which he has a share; while his most faithful services do but acknowledge a debt that money cannot cancel.

"10. *Bondage for crime, or government claims on criminals*. Must innocence be punished be-

cause guilt suffers penalties? True, the criminal works for the government without pay; and well he may. He owes the government. A century's work would not pay its drafts on him. He is a public defaulter, and will die so. Because laws make men pay their debts, shall those be forced to pay who *owe nothing*? Besides, the law makes no criminal, *PROPERTY*. It restrains his liberty; it makes him pay something, a mere penny in the pound, of his debt to the government; but it does not make him a *chattel*. Test it. To own property is to own its product. Are children born of convicts government property? Besides, can *property* be guilty? Are *chattels* punished?

"11. *Restrictions upon freedom.* Children are restrained by parents, wards by guardians, pupils by teachers, patients by physicians and nurses, corporations by charters, and legislators by constitutions. Embargoes, tariffs, quarantine, and all other laws, keep men from doing as they please. Restraints are the web of civilized society, warp and woof. Are they slavery? then civilized society is a mammoth slave,—a government of *LAW, the climax of slavery*,—and its executive a king among slave holders.

"12. *Involuntary or compulsory service.* A juryman is empanelled *against his will*, and sit he *must*. A sheriff orders his posse; bystanders *must* turn in. Men are *compelled* to remove nuisances, pay fines and taxes, support their families, and 'turn to the right as the law directs,' *however much against their wills*. Are they *slave* before slaves? To confound slavery with involuntary service is absurd. Slavery is a *condition*. The slave's feelings toward it are one thing; the condition itself, the object of these feelings, is *another* thing; his feelings cannot alter the nature of that condition. Whether he *desire* or *detest* it, the condition remains the same. The slave's *willingness* to be a slave is no palliation of his master's guilt in holding him. Suppose the slave verily thinks himself a chattel, and consents that others may so regard him, does that *make* him a chattel, or make those guiltless who *hold* him as such? I may be sick of life, and I tell the assassin so that stabs me; is he any the less a murderer, because I *consent* to be made a corpse? Does my partnership in his guilt blot out his part of it? If the slave were willing to be a slave, his *voluntariness*, so far from lessening the guilt of the 'owner,' *aggravates* it. If slavery has so palsied his mind, and he looks upon himself as a chattel, and consents to be one, actually to *hold him as such*, fills in with his delusion, and confirms the impious falsehood. *These very feelings and convictions of the slave*, (if such were possible) increase a hundred fold the guilt of the master in holding him as property, and call upon him in thunder, immediately to recognize him as a *MAN*, and thus break the sorcery that binds his soul, cheating it of its birthright, and the consciousness of its worth and destiny.

"Many of the foregoing conditions and relations are *appendages* of slavery, and some of them inseparable from it. But no one, nor all of them together, constitute its *intrinsic, unchanging element*.

"We proceed to state affirmatively, that,—

ENSLAVING MEN IS REDUCING THEM TO ARTICLES OF PROPERTY, making free agents chattels, converting *persons* into *things*, sinking intelligence, accountability, immortality, into

merchandise. A *slave* is one held in this condition. He is a mere tool for another's use and benefit. In law, 'he owns nothing, and can acquire nothing.' *His right to himself is abrogated*. He is another's property. If 'he say my hands, my feet, my body, my mind, myself, they are figures of speech. To use himself for his own good is a *CRIME*. To keep what he *earns* is stealing. To take his body into his own keeping is *insurrection*. In a word, the *profit* of his master is the *END* of his being, and he a *mere means* to that end, a *mere means* to an end into which his interests do not enter, of which they constitute no portion. *MAN* sunk to a *thing*! the intrinsic element, the *principle* of slavery; *MEN* sold, bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped in cargoes, stored as goods, taken on executions, and knocked off at public outcry! Their *rights* another's conveniences, their interests, wares on sale, their happiness a household utensil; their personal, inalienable ownership, a serviceable article, or plaything, as best suits the humor of the hour; their deathless nature,—conscience, social affections, sympathies, hopes,—marketable commodities! We repeat it, *the reduction of persons to things*; not robbing a man of privileges, but of *himself*; not loading with burdens, but making him a *beast of burden*; not *restraining* liberty, but subverting it; not curtailing rights, but abolishing them; not inflicting personal cruelty, but annihilating *personality*; not exacting involuntary labor, but sinking him into an *implement* of labor; not abridging his human comforts, but abrogating his *human nature*; not depriving an animal of immunities, but *despoiling a rational being of attributes*, uncreating a *MAN* to make room for a *thing*!

"That this is American slavery, is shown by the laws of slave States. Judge Stroud, in his 'Sketch of the Laws relating to Slavery,' says, 'The cardinal principle of slavery,—that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings, but among *things*; is an article of property, a chattel personal,—obtains as undoubted law in all of these States,' (the slave States.) The law of South Carolina thus lays down the principle: 'Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER.' [Brevard's Digest, 220.] In Louisiana, 'a slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he *belongs*; the master may sell him, dispose of his *person*, his *industry*, and his *labor*; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but what *must* belong to his master.' [Civil Code of Louisiana, Art. 35.]

"This is American slavery. The eternal distinction between a person and a thing, trampled under foot,—the crowning distinction of all others,—their centre and circumference,—the source, the test, and the measure of their value,—the rational, immortal principle, embalmed by God in everlasting remembrance, consecrated to universal homage in a baptism of glory and honor, by the gift of His Son, His Spirit, His Word, His presence, providence, and power; His protecting shield, upholding staff, and sheltering wing; His opening heavens, and angels ministering, and chariots of fire, and songs of morning stars, and a great voice in

heaven, proclaiming eternal sanctions, and confirming the word with signs following.

"Having stated the *principle* of American slavery, we ask,

"DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION SUCH A PRINCIPLE? To the *law* and the *testimony* Just after the Israelites were emancipated from their bondage in Egypt, while they stood before Sinai to receive the law, as the trumpet waxed louder, and the mount quaked and blazed, God spake the ten commandments from the midst of clouds and thunderings. Two of those commandments deal death to slavery. Look at the eighth,—*'Thou shalt not steal,'* or, thou shalt not take from another what belongs to him. All man's powers of body and mind are God's gift to him. That they are *his own*, and that he has a right to them, is proved from the fact that God has given them to *him alone*, that each of them is a part of *himself*, and all of them together constitute himself. All else that belongs to man is acquired by the use of these powers. The interest belongs to him, because the *principal* does; the product is his, because he is the *producer*. Ownership of any thing is ownership of its use. The right to use according to will, is *itself* ownership. The eighth commandment presupposes and assumes the right of every man to his powers, and their product. Slavery robs of both. A man's right to himself is the only right absolutely original and intrinsic: his right to whatever else that belongs to him is merely *relative* to his right to himself,—is derived from it, and held only by virtue of it. SELF-RIGHT is the *foundation* right,—the *post in the middle*, to which all other rights are fastened. Slave holders, the world over, when talking about their RIGHT to their slaves, always assume *their own right to themselves*. What slave holder ever undertook to prove his own right to himself? He knows it to be a self-evident proposition, that *a man belongs to himself*,—that the right is intrinsic and absolute. The slave holder, in making out his own title to himself, makes out the title of every human being to *himself*. As the fact of being a man is itself the title, the whole human family have one common title deed. If *one* man's title is valid, *all* are valid. If one is worthless, all are. To deny the validity of the *slave's* title is to deny the validity of *his own*; and yet, in the act of making him a slave, the slave holder asserts the validity of his own title, while he seizes him as his property who has the *same* title. Further, in making him a slave, he does not merely unhumanize *one* individual, but UNIVERSAL MAN. He destroys the foundations. He annihilates *all* rights. He attacks not only the human race, but *universal* being, and rushes upon JEHOVAH. For rights are *rights*: God's are no more; man's are no less.

"The eighth commandment forbids the taking of any part of that which belongs to another. Slavery takes the *whole*. Does the same Bible which forbids the taking of *any* thing belonging to him, sanction the taking of *every* thing? Is it such a medley of absurdities as to thunder wrath against him who robs his neighbor of a *cent*, while it bids God speed to him who robs his neighbor of *himself*? Slavery is the highest possible violation of the eighth commandment. To take from a man his earnings, is theft. But to take the *earner*, is compound,

superlative, perpetual theft. It is to be a thief by profession. It is a trade, a life of robbery, that vaults through all the gradations of the climax at a leap—the dread, terrific, giant robbery, that towers among other robberies, a solitary horror, monarch of the realm. The eighth commandment forbids the taking away, and the *tenth* adds, *'Thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor's;'* thus guarding every man's right to himself and his property, by making not only the actual taking away a sin, but even that state of mind which would tempt to it. Who ever made human beings slaves, or held them as slaves without *coveting* them? Why do they take from them their time, their labor, their liberty, their right of self-preservation and improvement, their right to acquire property, to worship according to conscience, to search the Scriptures, to live with their families, and their right to their own bodies? Why do they take them, if they do not *desire* them? They cover them for purposes of gain, convenience, lust of dominion, of sensual gratification, of pride and ostentation. *They break the tenth commandment*, and pluck down upon their heads the plagues that are written in the book. Ten commandments constitute the brief compend of human duty. Two of these brand slavery as sin.

"The giving of the law at Sinai, immediately preceded the promulgation of that body of laws and institutions, called the 'Mosaic system.' Over the gateway of that system, fearful words were written by the finger of God—*'HE THAT STEALETH A MAN AND SELLETH HIM, OR IF HE BE FOUND IN HIS HAND, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH.'* See Exodus, xxi. 16.

"The oppression of the Israelites in Egypt and the wonders wrought for their deliverance, proclaim the reason for *such* a law at *such* a time—when the body politic became a theocracy, and reverently waited for the will of God. They had just been emancipated. The tragedies of their house of bondage were the realities of yesterday, and peopled their memories with thronging horrors. They had just witnessed God's testimony against oppression in the plagues of Egypt—the burning blains on man and beast—the dust quickened into loathsome life, and cleaving in swarms to every living thing—the streets, the palaces, the temples, and every house heaped up with the carcasses of things abhorred—even the kneading troughs and ovens, the secret chambers and the couches, reeking and dissolving with the putrid death—the pestilence walking in darkness at noonday, the devouring locusts and hail mingled with fire, the first-born death-struck, and the waters blood, and, last of all, that dread high hand, and stretched out arm, that whelmed the monarch and his hosts, and strewed their corpses in the sea. All this their eyes had looked upon,—earth's proudest city, wasted and thunder-scared, lying in desolation, and the doom of oppressors traced on her ruins in the handwriting of God, glaring in letters of fire mingled with blood, a blackened monument of wrath to the uttermost against the stealers of men.

"No wonder that God, in a code of laws prepared for such a people at such a time, should light up on its threshold a blazing beacon to flash terror on slave holders. *'He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found*

in his hand, he shall be surely put to death.' Ex. xxii. 16. God's cherubim and flaming sword guarding the entrance to the Mosaic system!

"The crime, as stated in the passage, is threefold—*man stealing, selling and holding*. All are put on a level, and whelmed under one penalty—DEATH. This *somebody* deprived of the ownership of man, is the *man himself*, robbed of personal ownership. Contrast this penalty for *man-stealing* with that for *property-stealing*. Exod. xxii. If a man stole an ox and killed or sold it, he was to restore five oxen; if he had neither sold nor killed it, the penalty was two oxen. The selling or the killing being virtually a deliberate repetition of the crime, the penalty was more than doubled.

"But in the case of stealing a *man*, the first act drew down the utmost power of punishment; however often repeated, or however aggravated the crime, human penalty could do no more. The fact that the penalty for *man-stealing* was death, and the penalty for *property-stealing*, the mere *restoration of double*, shows that the two cases were adjudicated on totally different principles. The man stolen might be past labor, and his support a *burden*, yet death was the penalty, though not a cent's worth of *property value* was taken. The penalty for stealing *property* was a mere *property-penalty*. However large the amount stolen, the payment of *double* wiped out the score. It might have a greater *money* value than a *thousand men*, yet *death* was never the penalty, nor maiming, nor branding, nor even *stripes*. Whatever the kind, or the amount stolen, the unvarying penalty was double of *the same kind*.

"Further, when *property* was stolen, the whole of the legal penalty was a compensation to the person injured. But when a *man* was stolen, no property compensation was offered. To tender *money* as an equivalent, would have been to repeat the outrage with the intolerable aggravations of supreme insult and impiety. Compute the value of a *MAN* in *money*! Throw dust into the scale against immortality! The law recoiled from such outrage and blasphemy. To have permitted the man-thief to expiate his crime by restoring double, would have been making the repetition of crime its atonement. But the infliction of death for *man-stealing* exacted from the guilty wretch the utmost possibility of reparation. It wrang from him, as he gave up the ghost, a testimony in blood, and death-groans, to the infinite dignity and worth of man,—a proclamation to the universe, voiced in mortal agony, that *MAN* IS INVIOLEABLE,—a confession shrieked in phrenzy at the grave's mouth—'I die accused, and God is just.'

"The incessant pains-taking throughout the Old Testament, in the separation of human beings from brutes and things, shows God's regard for the sacredness of his own distinction.

"In the beginning' the Lord uttered it in heaven, and proclaimed it to the universe as it rose into being. He arrayed creation at the instant of its birth, to do it reverent homage. It paused in adoration while He ushered forth its crowning work. Why that dread pause, and that creating arm held back in mid career, and that high conference in the Godhead? 'Let us make man in OUR IMAGE, after OUR LIKENESS, and let him have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and

over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.'

"Then while every living thing, with land, and sea, and firmament, and marshalled worlds, waited to catch and swell the shout of morning stars—THEN 'GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS OWN IMAGE. IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM.' This solves the problem, IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM. Well might the sons of God cry all together, 'Amen, alleluia'—'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive blessing and honor—'For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet. O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth.' Psalm viii. 5, 6, 9. What an enumeration of particulars, each separating infinitely MEN from brutes and things!

"1. 'Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.' Slavery drags him down among brutes.

"2. 'And hast crowned him with glory and honor.' Slavery tears off his crown, and puts on a yoke.

"3. 'Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands.' Slavery breaks his sceptre, and casts him down among those works—yea, *beneath them*.

"4. 'Thou hast put all things under his feet.' Slavery puts him *under the feet of an owner*, with beasts and creeping things. Who, but an impious scorner, dare thus strive with his Maker, and mutilate his IMAGE, and blaspheme the Holy One, who saith to those that grind his poor, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me.'

#### IMPORT OF THE WORD "BUY," AND THE PHRASE "BOUGHT WITH MONEY."

"From the direction to the Israelites to 'buy' their servants, and from the phrase 'bought with money,' applied to Abraham's servants, it is argued that they were articles of *property*. The sole ground for this belief is the terms 'buy' and 'bought with money,' and such an import to these terms when applied to servants is assumed, not only in the absence of all proof, but in the face of evidence to the contrary.

"Bible saints *bought* their wives. Boaz *bought* Ruth. 'So Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of Mahlon, have I *purchased* to be my wife.' Ruth iv. 10. Hosea *bought* his wife. 'So I *bought* her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for an homer of barley, and an half homer of barley.' Hosea iii. 2. Jacob *bought* his wives Rachel and Leah, and not having money, paid for them in labor—seven years a piece. Gen. xxix. 15—29. Moses probably *bought* his wife in the same way, and paid for her by his labor, as the servant of her father. Exod. ii. 21. Shechem, when negotiating with Jacob and his sons for Dinah, says, 'What ye shall say unto me, I will *give*. Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me.' Gen. xxxiv. 11, 12.

"The highest price of wives (virgins) and servants was the same. Compare Deut. xxii. 28, 29, and Exod. xxii. 17, with Lev. xxvii. 2—8. The *medium* price of wives and servants

was the same. Compare Hosea iii. 2, with Exod. xxi. 2. Hosea appears to have paid one-half in money and the other in grain. Further, the Israelitish female bought-servants were *wives*, their husbands and their masters being the same persons. Exod. xxi. 8, and Judges xix. 3, 27. If *buying* servants among the Jews shows that they were property, then *buying wives* shows that *they* were property. The words in the original used to describe the one, describe the other. Why not contend that the wives of the ancient fathers of the faithful were their chattels, and used as ready change at a pinch? And thence deduce the rights of modern husbands. How far gone is the Church from primitive purity! How slow to emulate illustrious examples! Alas! patriarchs and prophets are followed afar off! When villainous husbands live up to their Bible privileges, and become partakers with Old Testament worthies in the blessedness of a husband's rightful immunities! Surely professors of religion now, are *bound* to buy and hold their wives as property! Refusing so to do, is to question the morality of those 'good old' wife-trading 'patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,' with the prophets, and a host of whom the world was not worthy.

"Even at this day the word *buy* is used to describe the procuring of servants, where slavery is abolished. In the British West Indies, where slaves became apprentices in 1834, they are still 'bought.' This is now the current word in West India newspapers. So a few years since in New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and even now in New Jersey servants are '*bought*' as really as in Virginia. And the different senses in which the same word is used in the two states, puts no man in a quandary, whose common sense amounts to a modicum.

"So under the system of legal indenture in Illinois, servants now are '*bought*.' A short time since, hundreds of foreigners who came to this country were 'bought' annually. By voluntary contract they engaged to work for their purchasers a given time to pay for their passage. This class of persons called 'redemptioners,' consisted at one time of thousands. Multitudes are *bought out* of slavery by themselves or others, and remove into free states. Under the same roof with the writer is a 'servant bought with money.' A few weeks since, she was a slave. As soon as 'bought,' she was a slave no longer. Alas! for our leading politicians if 'buying' men makes them 'chattels.' The Whigs say that Benton and Rives were 'bought' by the administration with the surplus revenue; and the other party, that Clay and Webster were 'bought' by the Bank. The histories of the revolution tell us that Benedict Arnold was 'bought' by British gold. Did that make him an article of property? When a northern clergyman marries a rich southern widow, country gossip hits off the indecency with this current phrase, 'The cotton bags *bought* him.' When Robert Walpole said, 'Every man has his price, and whoever will pay it can *buy* him,' and when John Randolph said, while the Missouri question was pending, 'The northern delegation is in the market; give me money enough, and I can *buy* them,' they both meant *just what they said*.

When the temperance publications tell us that candidates for office *buy* men with whiskey; and the oracles of street tattle, that the court, district attorney, and jury, in the late trial of Robinson were *bought*, we have no floating visions of chattels personal, man auctions, or coffles.

"Obtaining permanently the *services* of persons; or even a portion of them, is called 'buying' those persons. The objector, at the outset, assumes that servants were bought of *third* persons; and thence infers that they were articles of property. This is sheer *assumption*. Not a single instance is recorded, of a servant being sold by any one but himself; not a case, either under the patriarchal, or the Mosaic systems, in which a *master sold his servant*. That the servants who were 'bought' *sold themselves*, is a fair inference from various passages of Scripture.

"Again, if servants were *bought of third persons*, where are instances? In the purchase of wives, though spoken of rarely, it is generally stated that they were bought of *third* persons. Is it not a fair inference, if servants were bought of third persons, that there would sometimes have been such an intimation?"

I regret that my limits will not permit me to incorporate more of Mr. Weld's able argument, which makes an octavo pamphlet of about *eighty pages*, confined entirely to the Old Testament view of slavery. It ought to be in the hands of every clergyman. Any clergyman who will apply for it to R. G. Williams, 143 Nassau Street, New York, can have it *gratis*. Postage under 100 miles, 8 cts, over 100 miles, 14 cts. Should it accommodate any of our brethren better, application may be made, I presume, through Rev. L. R. Sunderland, 96 Nassau Street. In either case, the postage, if the order be sent by mail, should be paid.

I have only given a specimen of Mr. Weld's manner of treating the subject. Among other things, he makes it clearly to appear, that all servitude among the Jews was *voluntary*, and *fully compensated*; and that "bought servants," as some were termed, were a more privileged class, than "hired servants."

The following contrast of Jewish servitude with American slavery, is from the Anti-Slavery Manual, by Rev. L. R. Sunderland, as also "Bible Arguments Answered," and "Scripture Arguments against Slavery." These it will be seen are mere outlines, left for the reader to fill up.

#### JEWISH SERVITUDE UNLIKE AMERICAN SLAVERY.

##### *Peculiarities of the Jewish Economy.*

"1. A Hebrew was permitted to kill a man



who had murdered his friend, (Num. xxxv. 19;) and he might do this without the process of trial. And upon the same ground, the Jews were permitted to commence and carry on exterminating wars, against the idolatrous nations around them. Hence, we suppose, that it is as really wrong for any man in this age of the world, to take away the liberty of his innocent neighbor, or to withhold it from him in any way, without an express permission from God, as it would be for one to kill the murderer of his friend now, without the forms of law.

*No hereditary slavery among the Jews.*

"2. Two thirds of the servants in Israel were free at the end of six years; and the fiftieth year all were set free. There was no such thing as hereditary servitude among the Jews. Lev. xxv. 10; Deut. xv. 12.

"But American slavery is perpetual, to the very last moment of the slave's earthly existence, and by law it is entailed upon all of his descendants, to the latest posterity.

*Jewish servitude was voluntary*

"3. Jewish servitude was voluntary, except in those cases where it was the penalty annexed to crime. They sold themselves, i. e. their service, for an equivalent, so they were not slaves; as an equivalent—to a state of slavery—is impossible. Lev. xxv. 47; Neh. v. 8; Deut. xviii. 68; [Expose yourselves for sale,] 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25; 2 Kings xvii. 17; Isa. l. 1; Rom. vii. 14; Jer. xxxiv. 14, margin, *sold himself*.

"But American slavery is involuntary. No one who is now a slave in this land, was ever consulted, before his liberty was taken away, whether he would be a slave or not, and if he had been, he could not have given his master a just and proper title to his body as his property.

*Jewish servants could contend with their masters.*

"4. Under the Mosaic economy, servants might contend with their masters about their rights; and to despise the cause of which was considered a heinous crime. Job xxxi. 13.

"But here in this land of Christians, slaves can make no contract of any kind, they can have no legal right to any property; all they have and are, belong to their masters.

*Jewish servants made free when cruelly treated.*

"5. The laws of Moses granted freedom to a servant who had been cruelly treated. Exodus xxi. 26, 27.

"But our Christian laws allow the master to punish his slave as much as he desires, and afford the slave no redress; nay, if the slave makes any resistance, the law expressly justifies the master in putting him to death. In Kentucky, 'any negro, mulatto, or Indian, bond or free,' who 'shall at any time' even 'lift his hand in opposition to any white person, shall receive THIRTY LASHES on his or her bare back, WELL LAID ON, by order of the justice.'

*Servitude among the Jews did not jeopardize the lives of servants.*

"6. The master who killed a servant with a rod, or by blows, suffered the penalty of death, as other murderers. Lev. xxiv. 17, 21;

Num. xxxv. 30. So that their lives were as safe and as valuable in the eye of the law, as their master's.

"In these United States, many a slave has been killed by the treatment he has received from the hand of his master, overseer or driver; and no instance has been known of a white man's being put to death for such murder.

*Domestic relations.*

"7. Servants were carefully protected among the Jews, in their domestic relations; so that parents and their children must not be separated. And in case the mother did not get her freedom as soon as her husband, the children remained with her; and her master was bound to receive him to service again, in case he chose to live with his wife and children. Ex. xxi. 7, 11. They were entitled to an adequate subsistence, Deut. xxv. 4; 1 Tim. v. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 9, and treated with humanity. Lev. xxv. 39, 53.

"But here, slaves are entirely unprotected in their social and domestic relations; husbands and wives, parents and their children may be, and they are separated and parted forever, at the irresponsible will of the master.

"It is true that a law in one of the States provides, that 'Every owner shall be held to give his slaves one barrel of Indian Corn, or the equivalent thereof in rice, beans or other grain, and a pint of salt; and to deliver the same in kind every month, under the penalty of a fine of ten dollars for every offence.'—But this law may be as it is, easily evaded, on the ground that the slave cannot be a party in a civil suit, or a colored person a witness against a white person.

"A law of North Carolina provides that each slave shall receive at least 'one quart of corn per day;' and if any one who does not receive this amount be convicted of stealing corn, cattle, &c., from any person not the owner of such slave, such injured person may maintain an action of trespass against the master, and shall recover his or her damages. Another law provides, that the 'slave shall be entitled to receive from his owner one linen shirt and pantaloons for the summer, and a linen shirt and woolen great coat and pantaloons for the winter.'

*Instruction and consolation.*

"8. The laws of Moses secured to servants the necessary means of instruction and consolation. Deut. xxi. 9, 13; xxix. 10, 13.

"But no such laws exist in this land; here the operation of the laws tend directly to deprive the slaves of all 'mental' and religious 'instruction,' for their whole power is exerted to keep their slaves in the lowest kind of ignorance.

*Laws for the protection of strangers.*

"9. The laws of Moses required every one to pity and love the strangers who might chance to come among the Jews, and under severe penalties they were forbidden to vex or oppress them in any way. Ex. xxiii. 6, 9; xxi. 20; xii. 48, 50; Lev. xix. 33, 34; xxv. 35, 36; Num. xv. 15, 16, 29; Deut. i. 16, 17; x. 18, 19; Exodus xxii. 21; xxiii. 9.

"Here the laws view every colored stranger

as an enemy, and they consider him a slave until he proves his freedom.

*Fugitive servants.*

"10. If a servant escaped from his master and fled to the land of Israel, the law of Moses commanded every one to protect him; and forbade any one to deliver such to his master again. Deut. xxiii. 15.

"But here, if a slave escape from his master, and flee to any part of the United States, the law forbids any one to protect him, and commands that he be delivered up to his master.

*Husbands and wives.*

"11. If a Jewish servant had taken a wife of his master, and wished still to live with him, he had the privilege. Ex. xxi. 5, 6; Deut. xv. 18.

"But it is not thus with American slaves; among them, husbands and wives are parted at the irresponsible will of the slave holder. In point of law, an American slave cannot be married at all.

*Time for rest allowed Jewish servants.*

"12. Those servants among the Jews who had served fifty years had at least seventeen years rest in Sabbaths, feasts, &c. Ex. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; xii. 17, 18; xvi. 11; Matt. xxv. 21, 23. [Mr. Weld after a minute calculation, makes the time of rest to a servant in fifty years, TWENTY THREE YEARS AND SIXTY FOUR DAYS.]

"But nothing of this kind has ever been known among the Americans held in bondage by the Christians of this nation.

*When they were set free, compensation was allowed them and not to their masters.*

"13. When Jewish servants went out free, they were to be liberally furnished with means to begin life with. Ex. xxi. 2, 4; Lev. xxv. 17; Deut. xv. 13, 14.

"But in this land if any poor slave goes free at all, by the consent of his master, he goes free with nothing but his poor worn-out body, and his master demands a price for his liberation!

*Jewish servants held property.*

"14. They had the fruits of the rest years, and the gleanings of harvests. Lev. xix. 9, 10; xxv. 6; Ex. xxiii. 11; 1 Sam. ix. 8; Matt. xviii. 25.

"But here a slave can possess nothing but what is made by law to belong to his master.

*They were endowed with authority.*

"15. Eligible to offices. 1 Chron. xv. 18; xvi. 5, 38; xxvi. 12, 14; Matt. xxv. 21; 2 Sam. ix. 9, 10; Neh. v. 15.

"Not so in this nation. Here a slave cannot be a witness in a case where a white man is concerned. And in the city of New York a free colored American, in the year 1836, could not obtain a license even to drive a cart. And in many parts of the country, colored Americans are not admitted to the elective franchise.

*Jewish servants could not be made articles of traffic.*

"16. They could not be sold. Ex. xxi. 7, 8.

"But here thousands of slaves are sold annually, from one State to another, and many

of them by members and ministers of the same church to which the slaves themselves belong.

*They were marriageable in the families of their masters.*

"17. Jewish masters were obliged to provide for the marriage of maid servants, if he did not take them to himself, or his sons. Ex. xxi. 8.

"But American slave holders allow no legal marriage for their slaves, but they rather provide for their living in concubinage and adultery.

*They were on a level with the children under age.*

"18. They could be incorporated into the family, Ex. xxi. 8, 9, by circumcision. Ex. xii. 43, 45; Lev. xxii. 10, 11; 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35, consequently could be heirs. Gen. xv. 3; Prov. xvii. 2; Mark xii. 7; Luke xx. 14.

"But American slaves have no such privileges;—they are on a level with brutes, so far as rights are concerned—they can make no bargains of any kind.

*No impediments in the way to prevent the freedom of Jewish servants.*

"19. They could be redeemed, or redeem themselves, at any time. Lev. xxv. 48.

"American slaves have no such power.—Here, laws have been enacted to prevent emancipation, even when the slave holder is willing to confer it.

"Thus we see, that the evils which are always, more or less, attendant upon American slavery, were not consequent upon the servitude allowed among the Jews, such as slave prisons, slave markets, slave auctions, chains, iron yokes, shackles, whips, thumb-screws, &c. &c. Among the Jews there was no violent separation of parents and children, no parting of husbands and wives, no barbarous punishments, or any one thing in fact, which rendered Jewish servitude like American slavery."

**BIBLE ARGUMENTS, IN FAVOR OF AMERICAN SLAVERY, ANSWERED.**

*Example of the Jews.*

"The example of the Jews, it is said, may be quoted in favor of American slavery.

"But if so, why not quote the same authority, to justify exterminating wars and polygamy? Why not quote the Jewish example to compel every man to marry his brother's widow, in case his brother dies without children? Why not quote the same authority to prove that every man has a right to kill the murderer of his nearest relative, without any judicial process? Why not quote Jewish examples for putting a disobedient child to death?

*Servants held as property.*

"2. Servants among the Jews, it is supposed, are spoken of as property, Ex. xxi. 21. For he is his money. The meaning is, the servant's labor was to the master for the time being, the same as money. Servants among the Hebrews were not claimed, held, and treated as property, as we shall elsewhere show.

*Christ did not condemn slavery.*

"3. Again we are told, that Jesus Christ did not condemn slavery by name. We answer, neither did he condemn offensive wars, gambling, lotteries, ruin-making, and theatres, by name.

*Servants mentioned in the New Testament not slaves.*

"4. It is supposed by some that the words rendered *servant* in the New Testament, signify, invariably, such as were claimed, held, and treated as absolute property.

"But this is by no means the fact. The word generally rendered *servant*, in the New Testament, is *δουλος*. According to Parkhurst, it comes from the Hebrew *dol*, which signifies *weak, powerless, poor, exhausted*. Hence, the first signification given to *δουλος* by the best Greek Lexicographers, is, *one in a servile state, a servant*. This is the first definition affixed to this word, by Parkhurst, Ewing, Grove, and Greenfield, Editor of Bagster's Comprehensive Bible. Donnegan says it means *a slave, a servant*.

"This word occurs in the New Testament one hundred and twenty-one times. It is applied to Christ, to Moses, and the prophets. Phil. ii. 7; Rev. x. 7—xv. 3. In twelve instances it is applied to the apostles; fourteen times it is applied to Christians; and six times to sinners. And in about seventy places it is used to designate one in a state of *secular servitude, a servant*.

"That this word was not generally used by the apostles to designate one who was claimed, held, and treated as property, is farther evident from the following considerations. (1.) In the Greek language this word corresponds with our word *servant*; it does not necessarily signify one who was held and treated as property; but it was used to designate one in a *servile state*, most generally a *slave*.

"(2.) In Athens, however, this word was not used to signify a *slave* properly so called. See Robinson's *Antiq. of Greece*, p. 30, and Potter's *Gr. An.*, Vol. I., p. 68, and the number of the *Bib. Repository* for January, 1835.

"From these authorities we will learn that among the Athenians, slaves, or those who were the *entire property* of another, were called *οικηται*, but after their freedom was granted them, they were named *δουλοι*, not being then, like the former, a part of the master's estate, though they were held in a kind of servitude, being required to render some rude service, such as was required of the *μετοικαι*, [resident strangers,] to whom, in some respects, they were inferior.

"Now when we consider that the Attic Greek is *substantially* the language in which the New Testament was written, it seems quite probable that its writers did not, in using this word, depart from the sense above given.

"(3.) This word was used sometimes by St. Paul, to designate a kind of servitude which he himself condemned, 1 Cor. vii. 21, 23; Philemon, 16.

"(4.) The other word, rendered *servant*, in the New Testament is *οικητης*, from *οικος*, a house; a *domestic, a servant, a house servant or slave*. This word occurs but four times in the New Testament, Acts x. 7; Romans xiv. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 18; and Luke xvi. 13.

"In the last passage here given, the reader will see at once that it could not have been used to signify one who was the *entire property* of another.

"But admitting that this word is used in one place (1 Pet. ii. 18) to signify those servants

who were held as slaves, it by no means follows from this fact, that the apostle meant by using it, to justify the *claim* of the slave holder in that case. He directs those servants or slaves how to suffer the *injuries* which might be inflicted upon them, but he does not direct the slave holder *how* to inflict them. When he addresses masters, he commands them to render unto their servants that which is *just and equal*, and which command is a direct *condemnation of slavery*.

*Were the masters mentioned in the New Testament slave holders?*

"5. But we are told again that the words used by the apostle, in speaking of masters, necessarily imply such as held *slaves*.

"1. The word *κυριος*, *lord or master*, is used in the Bible as a title of authority or respect, but never to signify the owner of human beings. Gen. xviii. 12; 1 Cor. viii. 5; Acts xvi. 30.

"2. The classical meaning of *δεσποτης* is a *despot, a sovereign, a master of slaves*. But in the New Testament it does not invariably bear this signification.

"It occurs in ten different passages; in six of them it is applied to Jesus Christ, or God. Luke ii. 29; Acts iv. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 21; (compare verse 19, and Heb. iii. 6;) 2 Pet. ii. 1; Jude iv; Rev. vi. 10.

"In four places it is used to signify earthly rulers or masters. 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Titus ii. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 18.

"This word is sometimes used to signify the head or ruler of a family, as the reader will see by turning to the following places:—Matt. x. 25, and xxiv. 43; Mark xiv. 14; Luke xii. 39, xiii. 25, xxii. 11.

*Servants under the yoke.*

"But in 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, it has been supposed to signify such as held servants as their absolute property.

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.

"And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them because they are brethren, but rather do them service, because they are faithful and beloved partakers of the benefit."

"That there are two kinds of servants spoken of in the verses above quoted, we think is evident from a number of considerations.

"1. The peculiar phraseology of the passages determines this fact. Those servants who were claimed and treated as property, or absolute slaves, are said to be 'under the yoke'; those who were not claimed and held in this state, had 'believing masters.'

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed."

"But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful partakers of the benefit."

"That *or*, in this second verse, is an adversative conjunction, and should be rendered *but*, is well known, as this is not the word which is generally translated *and*, in the New Testa-

ment. This is a matter of fact, which no person at all acquainted with the original language of the New Testament, will dispute.—Hence we say, that the manner of the apostle's speaking here proves that two kinds of servants are meant; first, he refers to such as were claimed and held by their heathen masters as their absolute property, and tells them what he wishes them to do, and the reason why they should do it; and then he speaks of another class, by saying—'But those who have believing masters,' and who, consequently were not claimed, held, and treated as property, and who are thus put in opposition to such as were 'under the yoke.'

"2. Look at the different motives by which these two classes of servants are exhorted to perform certain duties. Those 'under the yoke' are exhorted to obedience, upon the consideration that their disobedience would bring a *dishonor* upon religion. Not so with those who had 'believing masters;' these were exhorted not to forsake their masters, because they were brethren, and which exhortation is plainly based upon the supposition, that they might forsake them if they chose. But to interpret the second verse as referring to one and the same kind of servants, and also to one and the same kind of masters as those mentioned in the first verse, so far as the act of slave holding was concerned, at once destroys the evident distinction made here by the apostle. This is so plain, that we see not how any one can deny it.

"3. But suppose the apostle, instead of saying 'believing despotes,' had said converted idolater, or converted Jew, should we understand him as meaning by these terms, a real, practical idolater, or real practical Jew? Not at all; no more than when a man speaks of a *converted infidel* we are to understand him as meaning to designate one who had never embraced the Christian religion. And thus one might speak of a converted slave holder, using the term *slave holder*, not to describe his present relation, but to designate his former character; and precisely in this sense we believe the apostle used the term '*despotes*' in 1 Tim. vi. 2.

#### *Specific Directions of the New Testament.*

"Another argument drawn from the New Testament, is generally stated thus: The apostles, by their specific directions to masters and servants, did, *de facto*, justify the relation which existed between the *slave holder* and his *slave*. To this we answer:

"(1.) This argument takes for granted, what has never been proved, *viz.* that all the servants and masters mentioned in the New Testament, were *slaves* and *slave holders*.

"(2.) But, admitting that the apostles did mean to justify the 'relation' which existed between master and slave, when that 'relation' gave the master the body of the slave as his *absolute property*, then it follows as an undeniable consequence that the holy apostles did mean to justify all the 'rights' to which this 'relation' entitled the master. If they justified such a 'relation,' they justified and approved *all the parts* of which it was composed.—And hence it would follow that the apostles justified, approved, and sanctioned a relation which authorized every master to commit *theft*, *adultery*, and *murder*. Those Romans who held slaves

in that relation, had a right in virtue of it, not only 'to box' them or 'to cuff' them 'on the ear,' but they were authorized and empowered by this relation to *torture* them, to *maim* them, and to *put them to death* in any way they chose, and according to Dr. Taylor's 'Elements of Civil law,' those slaves *could not be injured* in any way. And a relation which authorized and justified such *cruelties*, such *horrible*, and we may add, *diabolical injustice* as all this, many professing Christians and Ministers of the Gospel pretend to believe is 'authorized,' 'permitted,' and sanctioned by the Bible!!!"

I will here add an extract from the Address of the Synod of Kentucky. It will show that the moral vision of the ministers of Kentucky (some of whom were slave holders) was much clearer than that of many of the divines of the free States.

"The reply is often made, '*God's word sanctions slavery, and it cannot therefore be sinful. It cannot be our duty to relinquish our power over our slaves, or the Bible would have enjoined it upon us to do so.*' We will not attempt an elaborate argument against this plea for slavery—it needs no such answer. A few observations will suffice to show its utter fallacy. If the Bible sanctioned slavery, it sanctioned the kind of slavery which then existed, in the countries where the apostles preached and wrote their epistles. This was the system to which the apostles are supposed to have given their approbation—which they are supposed to have allowed their followers to support and sanction by their example. *Mark this well*—it was the *Greek and Roman slavery*, which God is said to have treated as a thing whose existence he did not condemn, as a system which his saints might, without sin, assist in perpetuating.

"There was no species of misery which the system of Greek and Roman slavery did not inflict upon its unhappy victims. Masters were permitted, by the laws, to torture their slaves, to starve them, to beat them to death, and even to throw them into their fish-ponds, to give an epicurean flavor to the mullets and carp, which they were fattening for their feasts. For the breaking of a dish, or the spilling of gravy, a slave could be put to death with impunity. It was part of this system, that if a master was murdered, and the murderer was not known, all the slaves of his household were seized and put upon the rack. Brethren, could any man insult the God of heaven worse than by declaring that he does not disapprove of such a system? Before we can admit so monstrous a doctrine, we must reverse all our ideas of the attributes of God. If any man can fairly show, that the Bible countenances such slavery as existed in the days of the apostles, he would construct a more powerful argument against the divine origin of our religion than infidelity has ever yet invented. A religion that sanctions a system of atrocious cruelty, can never have come down from heaven.

"We are told, again, that the apostles gave to Christian masters and Christian servants directions for the regulation of their mutual conduct. True; and these directions will be val-

nable while the world lasts; for so long, we doubt not, will the relation of master and servant exist. But how do such directions license holding of slaves? The terms which the apostles use in giving these precepts are the same terms which they would have used, had there been no slaves upon the earth. Many of the masters of that day were indeed slave holders, and many of the servants were slaves; but should that circumstance have prevented the inspired ambassadors from teaching the duties which devolve upon masters and servants, in every age and under every form of service? If so, then the fact that rulers at that time were generally tyrants, and the people vassals, should have prevented them from laying down the duties of rulers and people. In the precepts of holy writ, neither political tyranny nor domestic slavery is countenanced. Nay, if masters complied with the apostolic injunction to them, and gave their servants, as they were directed to do, 'that which is just and equal,' there would be at once an end of all that is properly called slavery.

"It has been sometimes said, that the '*New Testament does not condemn slave holding in express terms.*' And the practice has been advocated, because it has not been thus denounced. If this assertion were true, and if the Bible only virtually denounced it, it would be a sin. No man can righteously continue a practice which God disapproves of, no matter in what form the disapproval is expressed. But the assertion is not true. THE NEW TESTAMENT DOES CONDEMN SLAVE HOLDING, AS PRACTISED AMONG US, IN THE MOST EXPLICIT TERMS FURNISHED BY THE LANGUAGE IN WHICH THE INSPIRED PENMEN WROTE. If a physician, after a minute examination, should tell a patient that his every limb and organ was diseased—if he should enumerate the various parts of his bodily system, the arms, the legs, the head, the stomach, the bowels, &c., and should say of each one of these parts distinctly, that it was unsound; could the man depart and say, 'After all, I am not diseased; for the physician has not said in *express terms*, that my *body* is unsound?' Has he not received a *more clear and express declaration* of his entirely diseased condition, than if he had been told in merely general terms that his *body* was unsound? Thus has God condemned slavery. He has specified the parts which compose it, and denounced them, one by one, in most ample and unequivocal form. In the English language, we have the term *servant*, which we apply indiscriminately both to those held in voluntary subjection to another, and to those whose subjection is involuntary. We have also the term *slave*, which is applicable exclusively to those held in involuntary subjection. The Greek language had a word corresponding exactly in signification with our word *servant*; but it had none that answered precisely to our term *slave*. How then was an apostle, writing in Greek, to condemn *our slavery*? Could it be done in the way in which some seem to think it must be done, before they will be convinced of its sinfulness? How can we expect to find in Scripture the words 'slavery is sinful,' when the language in which it is written contained no term which expressed the meaning of our word *slavery*?—They pronounce of each one of those several

things which constitute slavery, *that it is sinful*; thus clearly and for ever denouncing the system, wherever it might appear, and whatever name it might assume. If a writer should take up each part of our Federal Constitution separately, and condemn it article by article, who would have the folly to assert that, after all, he had not expressly condemned the Constitution? Who would say, that this thorough and entire disapproval of every part of the instrument of consideration must pass for nothing, and is no proof of the writer's hostility to it, because he has never said in exactly so many words, 'I disapprove of the Constitution of the United States?' We see that he could condemn it most explicitly and thoroughly, without ever mentioning it by name.

"We are commanded to give our servants 'that which is just and equal;' and no sophistry can persuade us that we fulfil this toward those whom we deprive of the reward of their labor. The maintenance of this system breaks not one law of the Lord, or two laws; it violates the whole code—it leaves scarcely one precept unbroken. And will any one, then, contend that slavery is not reprobated by God, and that he may participate in the system, and assist in its perpetuation, without deep criminality? Forbid it, conscience—forbid it, common sense. Gaming, horse-racing, gladiatorial shows, in which men were hired to butcher each other; the selling of children by their parents, which was often practised in ancient days—all these things are condemned by the Scriptures, not by name, but (as slavery is condemned) by denouncing those crimes of which these acts are modifications and illustrations."

#### SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT AGAINST SLAVERY.

##### "*Slave holding is theft.*"

"1. To claim, hold, and treat a human being as property, is felony against God and man. Ex. xx. 15; Deut. xxiv. 7. If it be theft to reduce a man to slavery, it must be equally so to keep him in this state.

"About sixty thousand human beings are feloniously reduced to slavery in this country every year. As soon as they are born, they are claimed, seized, held, and treated as property.

##### "*Covetousness.*"

"2. All slave holding and slave dealing is covetousness, and, as such, it is forbidden. Ex. xx. 17; Isa. lvii. 17; Jer. li. 13; Ezek. xxxiii. 31; Luke xii. 15; Col. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 3.

"The man who claims the body of his fellow man as his property, does, *de facto*, covet that which, in the very nature of things, must belong to his neighbor, and to which no circumstances can give him a just title.

##### "*Oppression.*"

"3. Slavery is the very worst form of oppression.—Oppression is the spoiling or taking of another's person or goods or the fruit of his labor, by constraint, violence or force; and this crime is committed whenever one human being offers any violence to the person, estate, or conscience of another. Prov. xiv. 31; xxviii. 3; Isa. xlix. 26; Jer. vii. 6; xxi. 12, 13; Hos. xii. 7; Amos iv. 1; Mic. ii. 2; Zech. vii. 10; Mal. iii. 5; Eccl. iv. 1; Ezek. xxii. 29; Amos

*"Manstealing."*

"4. Slavery is manstealing, and as such is forbidden, under the severest penalties. Ex. xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7.

"How has the present slave holder come into possession of the children whom he now holds as his slaves? They were never willed to him, nor did he purchase them of another. How could he take possession of them, and part them from their parents, without stealing them?"

*"Enslavers."*

"5. The law of God was made for enslavers. 1 Tim. i. 10. The word here rendered manstealers, signifies to *enslave*, to *reduce to slavery*, to *treat men as cattle*.

*"Fraud and robbery."*

"6. Slavery is *legalized wholesale fraud and robbery*. Ezek. xviii. 4; Mal. iii. 8, 9; Prov. xxi. 7; Isa. lxi. 8; Ezek. xxii. 29; Amos iii. 10; Nah. iii. 1; Mark x. 19; 1 Thes. iv. 6; Jer. xxii. 3; James v. 4.

*"Traffic in the persons of Men forbidden."*

"7. American slavery is condemned in all those places which forbid trading in the persons of men. Ezek. xxvii. 13; Joel iii. 3, 6; Amos ii. 6; Zech. xi. 4, 5; Rev. xviii. 13. It could not exist without the slave trade.

*"Christian kindness."*

"8. The exercise of that kindness and pity which are commanded in the Bible toward the poor, is utterly irreconcilable with slavery. Lev. xxv. 35; Job vi. 14; xxxi. 16; Psal. xli. 1; lxxxii. 3; Prov. xxii. 22; xxiv. 11; xxxi. 8; Isa. i. 16; and lyiii. throughout; Jer. xxxiv. 10; Matt. xxv. 44; Heb. xiii. 3; 1 John iii. 17.

*"Duties of masters."*

"9. American slavery is condemned in the specific directions of the Apostle to masters and servants. 1 Cor. vii. 21, 23; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iv. 1. These precepts, if obeyed, would annihilate slavery at once, and for ever.

*"Analogy of the Gospel."*

"It is condemned in all those passages which represent the *evils of sin* by slavery, and Gospel benefits by freedom. Gal. iv. 3, 7, 22, 31; v. 1, 13; Isa. lxi. 1, 3; John viii. 32, 36.

*"The Golden Rule."*

"11. By the reciprocal and universal law of love, which is binding on all men. Matt. v. 7; vii. 12; xxii. 37; John xv. 12, 17; Rom. xii. 9; 1 Cor. xiii. 28.

*"Spirit of the Gospel."*

"12. Slavery cannot be reconciled with the spirit and design of the Gospel. It will not exist surely in the millennial state. Gen. iii. 15; xxii. 18; Luke iv. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 17; Zeph. iii. 9; Matt. iii. 10.

"It is condemned by the spirit of the Gospel—the precepts of the Gospel must be against it. of course, because the spirit of the Gospel is learned from its precepts.

*"Conditions of salvation."*

"13. To claim, hold, and treat a human being as property, is utterly at variance with the conditions upon which man is authorized to expect forgiveness and salvation from God. Matt. v. 23. Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy

brother hath *ought* against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; *FIRST* be reconciled with thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."—*Anti-Slavery Manual*.

REMARKS.

It is admitted I believe pretty generally, at least by our northern opponents, that *the spirit of the Gospel is opposed to slavery*; though they contend, 1. That the example of Christ and the apostles establishes the doctrine of *non interference* in relation to slavery. 2. That they did nevertheless *interfere*, so far as indirectly to sanction the condition of slavery, by giving specific directions to *masters and slaves* respecting their *duties to each other*. 3. That they received slave holders (even those who possessed and continued to retain the power to take the life of their slaves at pleasure) into the Church; and that they were good and holy members, "brethren beloved!" And, 4. That they no where condemned slavery, though it existed in its worst forms all around them! And yet many of these very persons tell us, that the *spirit of the Gospel* is opposed to slavery, and that all we have to do is to preach the Gospel, which will in time work the cure of *this* as well as all other evils.

Is it not a little strange, that the example of Christ and the apostles had not been in accordance with the *spirit of the Gospel*? To whom should we look to have the spirit of the Gospel fully carried out, if not to its Author and first preachers?

WHEN IS THE GOSPEL TO DESTROY  
SLAVERY?

If preaching the Gospel is ever to destroy slavery, when is it to *commence* that work? It is contended, that it did not destroy slavery in the first ages of Christianity, but that slave holders with absolute power over their slaves, were "brethren beloved," and were received into the Church. The Gospel has been preached in the United States for two hundred years, and for about *seventy years* by the Methodists, with slavery in the country all the while; and so far from having cured it, it has not yet, it would seem, commenced the work. Nay, but under the Gospel, slavery has grown more rampant. In our Church, it claims a *bishop*.

There are in the M. E. Church several hundred itinerant ministers who are *slave holders*, and their preaching it seems has not cured themselves; so far from it, that two whole conferences have lately said, that "*slavery is not a moral evil.*" Poor encouragement this, that the Gospel, *preached as it is in the South* and generally in the North, will ever cure slavery; which at this moment is striking its roots deeper and spreading its branches wider, both in Church and State. We have four times as many slaves, and much more of the spirit of slavery in our country now, than we had fifty years ago. And the Gospel has been preached during the whole time by different denominations. In this increase of slavery, the Church has kept pace with the State, to say the least. And so long as some of our best divines hold that the Golden Rule justifies and *requires* slave holding in some cases, I think we have not much reason to hope that preaching the Gospel will ever cure slavery.

#### THE GOSPEL OPPOSED TO SLAVERY.

That the Gospel is opposed to slavery, both in LETTER and SPIRIT, I firmly believe; and preaching it *as it ought to be preached*, will, I doubt not, undermine and destroy the whole system. Already has an anti-slavery Gospel freed *six hundred* slaves in our own country; and soon it will free thousands and tens of thousands more. We do not pretend to have received any new revelation, but are trying to carry out more fully and thoroughly certain specific features of the old apostolic Gospel. In opposing sin, the power of the Gospel must be brought to bear upon *particular evils*. *Generalizing* will not answer. We must *particularize*.

#### THE TEMPERANCE REFORMATION.

How has the great Temperance Reformation been carried on? Not by preaching a Gospel which is opposed to drunkenness and every thing else; but by preaching a Gospel which is opposed to drunkenness *in particular*. When the Temperance Reformation commenced, the Gospel had been preached in our country for two centuries; churches had been planted all over the land,—and drunkards had multiplied, and had been

manufactured even in the churches; distilleries and dram shops had appeared in every part of the country, and 30,000 were annually going to the drunkard's grave. Though the Gospel was preached, rum-makers and rum-drinkers did not feel its influence. But when its principles were brought to bear upon this *particular evil*, a hook was put into the jaws of this leviathan, Intemperance, and a storm of opposition was raised throughout the land. This Gospel he did not like, and could not bear. It is then *particular preaching* that has done the work in the temperance cause.

#### PRINCIPLE APPLIED.

The same is true of the anti-slavery cause. The preaching of the Gospel, as it has been preached in our country for a number of years past, has been to slavery like the dew of heaven. The poison-tree of slavery was indeed struck by the lightnings of truth in the days of COKE and ASBURY—but its broken limbs have been so well adjusted by our modern divines and learned doctors, that it has more than recovered its former strength and vigor.

There has been no objection in the South to a *general Gospel*. Slavery has flourished under it. Ministers have become slave holders "*from principle.*" And slave holders themselves can preach it as loudly as any body,—yes, preach the Gospel, and grind the faces of God's suffering poor,—preach the Gospel, and whip slaves,—preach the Gospel, and rob the laborer of his hire,—preach the Gospel, and barter immortal spirits for gold!

Such is the state of things which many of our Northern opponents think so much preferable to the abolition excitement! *It was all peace and harmony*; but now the Church is *agitated*. And to agitate the Church, under any circumstances, is, in the opinion of some, almost an unpardonable sin! Thank God, the old Wesleyan anti-slavery Gospel has been revived in the M. E. Church. Heaven speed it onward! The Gospel is now flashing through the country those flaming truths, "Break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free,"—"Wo unto him that useth his neighbor's services without wages, and giveth him not for his work,"—

"Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so to them," &c. But this is more than slavery can bear; its writhings and contortions are made manifest to all. It cries out for the old peaceful Gospel,—this modern preaching is too *particular and personal*. But keep the truth on the conscience. Continue to thunder in the oppressor's ears, "Break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free!" Truth will finally triumph, and the storm will become a calm. If our opponents suppose they can drive us from the field by pointing to the foaming billows or the sweeping tornado, they have most certainly mistaken their men. Never will we put off the harness (unless we put it off for our grave clothes), *till the oppressed go free!* We have counted the cost, and are prepared for the consequences. The path of duty has led through lions' dens, and furnaces of fire; and should it do so again, we hope not to prove recreant to the principles of a Gospel, which proclaims *liberty to the captives!* It is *always prudent* to be faithful; it is *always safe* to trust in God and speak his word, whether men will hear or forbear.

#### HOW IS THE WORLD TO BE REFORMED?

It is by preaching against great and destructive evils, *particularly, pointedly and perseveringly*, that the world is to be reformed. We have always preached a Gospel that has been opposed to licentiousness, but how seldom has it disturbed the licentious. Streams of corruption have run through our cities, and polluted every part of the country. But since the seventh commandment has been enforced in the pulpit and elsewhere, the workers of iniquity have been disturbed. Opposition has been raised; and could the cry of "The Union! the Union!" &c., and "The Church! the Church!" have been successfully connected with this branch of moral reform, the advocates of purity would, ere this, have been mobbed.

If there ever was a time when, not only the whole Gospel should be faithfully preached, but particular portions of it *constantly urged*, that time is the present. This is emphatically an age of vice; and what, if possible, is still more alarming, is the fact, that this is a com-

promising, time-serving age; especially so far as the Christian ministry is concerned. Out, then, brethren, upon all evil—especially *popular sins and sins of the Church*.

#### PAINS TAKEN TO DEFEND SLAVERY.

Such appears to be the desire of many of our great and good men to sustain the "patriarchal institution," that the whole vocabulary of language, aided by all the powers of logic and rhetoric, has been exhausted in attempting to show, that the holy apostles received slave holders into the Church; and that *some how*, and in *some circumstances*, men may be justified in holding slaves! Why all this pains to make out a case for slave holders? Suppose it were among *possibilities* for a man to be justified, in supposable circumstances, in holding a slave? Why take so much more pains to cover *him*, than to oppose *slavery*? Did Rev. W. Fisk or Bishop Hedding ever think it an object to take so much pains to justify good rum sellers or good rum drinkers? Perhaps they do not believe such characters could be justified, under any circumstances. Will they then pretend that "partakers with the thief" can be justified. Is it worse for men in health to drink a glass of rum, than to retain in their hands, not merely stolen property, but stolen human beings? If rum makers are justified when they manufacture, for medicinal purposes, or from "benevolent motives"—and if strong drink, "under certain circumstances," may be given to him that is ready to perish, why, when wholesale denunciations have been dealt out by temperance lecturers against those who make, vend, or use intoxicating liquors, has not brother Fisk attempted by his logic and biblical criticisms, to shield these characters? Probably for this reason; if he has ever heard language too severe, or witnessed measures too ultra in the temperance cause, he has feared that his influence might be claimed on the wrong side, if he should attempt to condemn these things, or to apologize for *good men*, who, perhaps, have been represented as worse than drunkards. But he is not afraid of giving his influence to slavery, by opposing abolition, though he spends all his strength upon the latter without stopping to breathe a



sentence of condemnation against the former.

#### PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETING THE BIBLE.

Do not the principles of humanity and religion require us to interpret particular portions of the Scriptures in accordance with the general design and spirit of the Gospel, when it can be done without doing violence to the philology of language?

When certain passages of Scripture will bear different constructions, ought not that always to be preferred which is most in accordance with analogy of revealed truth? It appears to me, that there can be but one answer to these questions.

#### REMARKS ON 1 TIM. VI. 1, 2.

Brother Fisk and others have laid great stress upon 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2, to prove that slave holders were received into the Church by the apostles. This appears to be the strong hold of our opponents. It is the principal passage, I believe, which is relied on to prove that slave holders were "brethren beloved" in the times of the apostles.

The term *doulos* covers all kinds of servitude. All slaves are servants, though all servants are not slaves. Slaves are only one class of servants. When, therefore, the term *doulos* is used in the Scriptures to mean a slave *exclusively*, it is used in a restricted sense, and is generally qualified by some such term as "under the yoke." In the first verse of 1 Tim. vi., it is said, "Let as many *douloi* as are under the yoke [implying that there were *douloi* who were not under the yoke] count their own masters [no intimation that these masters were believers] worthy of all honor, [Why? To set an example of Christian patience and submission,] that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Not to justify the relation of *master* and *slave*; not because those masters who put yokes on the necks of human beings should be honored for such conduct,—but "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn the other; not because any man has a right to smite thee,—but "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." If "he take thy coat, let

him have thy cloak also;" not because he has any right to steal even thy coat,—but "that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." In a word, "render good for evil,"—not to *justify* "evil," but that your conduct may honor, and not reproach the Gospel. That no occasion may be given to enemies to "blaspheme."

#### DUTIES OF SERVANTS AND SLAVES.

In the first verse, the duties of *slaves* to *slave holders* are enjoined. Nothing is said either in this verse or the next about the duties of masters, though elsewhere masters are required to give their servants that which is "*just and equal*." How little do our northern apologists for slavery enforce this precept.

In the second verse, the duties of servants to *believing masters* are pointed out. Hired servants are *douloi*, and slaves are *douloi*. We *know* the term is used in a *restricted sense*, and therefore means slaves in the first verse, because the qualifying term, "under the yoke," is connected with it. But there is no such qualifying term in the second verse. To have made it certain that slave holders were received into the Christian Church, the second verse should have read, "And they that [are 'under the yoke,' who] have believing masters." But when *believing masters* are spoken of, the "yoke" is left out; when slaves and slave holders are spoken of, the "yoke" is mentioned. From this it appears, that, to say the least, it is not *certain* that slaves and slave holders are spoken of in the second verse. And the principal reason that has ever been offered to favor the notion that slave holders are spoken of in the second verse, is, its immediate connection with the first verse. Now is this a sufficient reason for giving such a construction to the passage, especially if it would be contrary to the analogy of revealed truth?

#### WHERE IS THE DANGER?

What impropriety is there in supposing that, in these verses, the apostle points out the duties of *all servants*, including both hired servants and slaves; that, in speaking of these two classes of servants, he speaks in the first verse *exclusively* of slaves, qualifying the term

*doulos* with one of the indisputable concomitants of slavery, "the yoke;" and that, in the second verse, he speaks of hired servants, leaving out the qualifying term "yoke." Would such a construction be contrary to the design and spirit of the Gospel, or the analogy of revealed truth? Would it do violence to any idiom of language? Are not these passages fairly capable of such a construction? Our learned divines will admit that they cannot *certainly know* that the apostle speaks of slaves in the second verse. If, then, we suppose him to mean hired servants in the second verse, and that be an error, what harm can grow out of it? But if we construe the apostle's language in that verse to mean *slaves*, and that be an error, may not infinite harm grow out of it? Ought we not to have as good evidence as the repetition of the term "yoke" would be, before we *dare* to send out the opinion, that the apostle spoke of slaves and slave holders in the second verse?

#### WHAT IS THE OBJECT?

But suppose the second verse will admit of different constructions, what is the *object* of construing it to mean slaves and slave holders? Why, to *favor* slave holders, of course! Commendable object! worthy of a *doctor of divinity*! Now, how it looks, to see ministers of the Gospel, putting on their glasses, and poring over the midnight oil, to find, somewhere in the Bible, a passage of Scripture that they think will *possibly bear* a construction that will favor—not ordinary thieves and robbers—but *men-stealers*! How does it *look*? And then upon these doubtful constructions, build

arguments in favor of the "present rightful authority" of slavery? If good men will take such pains to sustain a *bad relation*, what will bad men do? How awfully the understanding, or heart, or both, must be perverted to create a blinding influence strong enough to induce those ministers who are sent to proclaim liberty to the captives, to spend their whole strength, not to see how much they can find in the Bible against slavery, but how much they can find that can be *pressed* into the service of slavery! And that, too, when they know, or may know, that their word will eat as doth a canker; that such biblical criticism, especially from the North, will be a cordial to the most cruel and unprincipled slave holder in the land; that it will be a millstone upon millions of American citizens, to grind them to powder! These are strange times. Posterity will hardly believe the faithful historian of the present age. And many who are now passing the "great evil of slavery" in silence, and are opposing abolitionism on the one hand, and writing Bible arguments to sustain the relation of *master* and *slave* on the other, will, if they live a few years, hardly believe their own senses! The Counter Appeal, and similar documents, *will live*, and will be handed down to posterity as evidences of the *clear moral vision* of the clergy of the present age. But I forbear. The Lord bless our brethren who are unwittingly tightening the chains of slavery with Bible arguments, and "strengthening the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life."

## PART III.—THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

EXAMINATION OF THE "REVIEW OF THE LATE GENERAL CONFERENCE, HELD IN CINCINNATI, OHIO, MAY 1, 1836."

In the Methodist Magazine for January, 1838, I find an article entitled "A Review of the Proceedings of the late General Conference." The principal part of what relates to abolitionism has been copied into the Christian Advocate and Journal, and headed "a Defence of the last General Conference." A more appropriate title for that part which relates to abolitionism would have been "*an attack upon the character of O. Scott.*" Let any candid person read the article, and then say, whether this is not its true character. The violence and frequency with which I have been attacked of late by Rev. N. Bangs, who is understood to be the author of the "Review," seems to indicate that, in his opinion, an important object is to be accomplished by destroying my influence. Repeated and severe assaults have been made upon my character and veracity. Br. Bangs may think he has a good end in view, but whether the end will justify the means he is using, is a matter of some doubt.

My examination will be principally confined to what is said concerning Br. Winans and myself. This part of the Review contains some capital errors, as I shall be able, I think, to make clearly appear. But before coming to these, I will notice a few things which precede them.

SLAVERY AND ABOLITIONISM NOT THE SAME.

The reviewer commences with an attempt to show that *slavery* and *abolitionism* do not mean the same thing, and that the General Conference did not consider them synonymous terms. Several attempts are made to illustrate and prove this self-evident proposition. The reviewer thinks the General Conference could not have intended to condemn *slavery* by condemning *abolitionism*, because the former "has been *tolerated* in

our church from its very commencement."

Who have ever pretended that the General Conference condemned slavery by disapproving abolitionism, I know not. I know of many who have asserted that the General Conference *refused* to condemn slavery, though it pointedly condemned "modern abolition;" but I know of none, except Rev. N. Bangs, who have thought it necessary to prove that slavery and abolition mean different things; or that the General Conference were understood to condemn slavery, in disapproving of modern abolitionism! The reviewer must have seen "men as trees walking." Some of his words, on this point, are as follows:

"*Slavery and abolitionism* now demand our attention. Though we place these two in juxtaposition, yet it will be found, in the sequel, that, however much they may have been confounded by some writers, they are not words of synonymous import, nor were they so used and understood by the General Conference. *Slavery* relates to a *state*, and the *relation* of one human being to another; and *abolitionism* to the means used by some men for the *immediate* abrogation of *slavery*, and the consequent emancipation of the slave."

"Now will those who have so injuriously imputed the motives and misrepresented the actions of the General Conference pretend to say that it was *slavery* itself which they had *highly disapproved of*?"

"Here, then, it is most evident that it was *abolitionism*, and not *slavery*, against which the Conference arrayed themselves."

"The General Conference distinguished between *slavery* and *abolitionism*."

In relation to these labored attempts to distinguish between slavery and abolitionism, we may adopt the language of the Pittsburgh Conference Journal:

"The reviewer takes great pains to distinguish *slavery* and abolitionism. No doubt he has his reasons for doing so, though it is difficult to see a sufficient reason for dwelling so long upon it. We were not aware that any one was so stupid as to suppose that *slavery* and *abolitionism* mean the same thing; or, that the Conference, in opposing abolitionism, was understood by that action to be opposing slavery. The complaint has generally been that the case was the opposite of this.

Never, I presume, did it enter into the mind of an abolitionist, that the

General Conference opposed slavery by opposing abolitionism.

I ask the reviewer to put his finger on the place where abolitionists have ever said that the General Conference, by disapproving abolitionism, *disapproved* of slavery. I challenge him to do this! But he accuses the *abolitionists* of doing this. For he asks, "why, then, say with the very next breath, that this same Conference *refused* to pass sentence of condemnation upon slavery!" The last we have said, and we say it now; but the former never entered our hearts. "Such strange inconsistencies do men adopt, when impelled to their conclusions by the force of erroneous premises." But to what cause shall they be attributed in *this case*? Certainly not to the "want of mental training and intellectual culture." No; Rev. N. Bangs *can* "feel the force of a logical argument." The foregoing extracts abundantly prove this. "He gives [no] evidence of that species of insanity which arises from an undisciplined mind!" I can give no other reason then for these inconsistencies, than "the *fumes* of [anti] abolition excitement."

"If it be the effect of [anti] abolitionism to transform a man into such a reasoner, and to betray him into such inconsistencies, we should transfer the blame from the man to the cause he has espoused, and denounce *that* as a visionary project by which weak [strong] minds become *hallucinated*."

#### RARE SPECIMENS OF LOGIC.

But, be the *cause* what it may, I will give one or two more rare specimens of his "intellectual culture and mental training!"

"The *subject* upon which it [the Pastoral Address] treats is *abolitionism* and not *slavery*.—It says, 'We have been much *agitated* in some portions of our work with the very excitable subject of *abolitionism*.' Had the Conference designed to speak of *slavery*, they would not have used *this language*, as though it were a new and recent thing among us, because slavery has existed among us ever since we have been a nation, and has been *tolerated*, at least, in our Church from its very commencement. To have said, therefore, that we had just now been *agitated* on the subject of slavery, would have been saying nothing worthy of a moment's attention."

Here it is said, "had the Conference designed to speak of *slavery*, they would not have used *this language*! But did

they not use this very *language*, viz. that the church was "*agitated*" with "*slavery*," in their reply to the Wesleyan Conference? They said,

"In common with sister denominations in our country, we have been less or more *agitated* with the perplexing question of *negro slavery*."

"To have said, therefore, that we had just now been *agitated* on the subject of *slavery*, would have been saying nothing worthy of a moment's attention!" Put *this* and *that* together.—Here the General Conference are accused of saying, in their address to the Wesleyan Conference, "nothing worthy of a moment's attention!" This too, by the *great reasoner*—the man who never makes any mistakes. This is the man who *can* feel the "force of a logical argument," and who has had the benefits of "mental training and intellectual culture!" We might, it seems, tell our English brethren that "*negro slavery*" had "*agitated*" the church—but we must tell our American brethren that it was "*abolitionism*,"—(which, according to the reviewer, is a very different thing from slavery,) that had done this. Had we told our American brethren that negro slavery had "*agitated*" us, it would not have been "worthy of a moment's attention"—because that "had been *tolerated* in the church from its very commencement!"

Look also at the following specimen of anti-abolition\*logic and consistency.

The reviewer professes that one of his objects in "laying bare my errors and in administering the rod of correction," was to benefit myself. He says, "in hope that even he may derive profit from well merited, disciplinary chastisement." But a little farther on he says, "we have not written this for his sake who has done the wrong, *for we consider argumentation lost on a mind thus constituted!*" In one sentence the reviewer proposes to lay on the "rod of correction" in part for my benefit—in another he is going to correct *me*, wholly for the benefit of others—he has not written "for my sake;" "argumentation is lost" on me! This kind of logic he considers, I presume, straight and conclusive. Perhaps if I had been favored with "mental training and in-

tellectual culture," I might have felt "the force of [such] logical arguments!"

#### APOLOGY FOR ANTI-ABOLITIONISTS.

The reviewer apologizes for the heat and mistakes of the anti-abolitionists, as follows:

"We are indeed very far from making the attempt to justify every word that dropped from the lips of speakers, or every sentiment that was uttered in the warmth of debate. Those must be *more than human*, and more indeed than human nature is capable of attaining in this life, even under the powerful influence of Christianity, who should be exempt from all aberrations of intellect, from all errors in judgment, and who should utter nothing reprehensible in extemporaneous debate, where, especially, conflicting opinions excite much discussion.

But if an abolitionist happens to make a mistake in *reporting* the speech of an opponent, he must be published all over the land as guilty of "falsehood"—"palpable falsehood;" and that too by one from whom we ought to expect a better example! The frailties of human nature may be offered as the common apology for all men, the abolitionists only excepted. They must be perfect in every statement, or they are guilty of "palpable falsehood!"

#### RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The following preamble and resolutions were offered on the 12th of May, by Rev. S. G. Roszell, of the Baltimore Conference.

"Whereas, great excitement has pervaded this country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently, by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the General Conference in lecturing upon, and in favor of that agitating topic;—and whereas, such a course on the part of any of its members is calculated to bring upon this body the suspicion and distrust of the community, and misrepresent its sentiments in regard to the point at issue;—and whereas, in this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interests of the church confided to its care, demand a full, decided and unequivocal expression of the views of the General Conference in the premises—Therefore,

"1. *Resolved*,—By the delegates of the annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently, upon, and in favor of, modern abolitionism.

"2. *Resolved*,—By the delegates of the annual Conferences in General Conference assembled,—that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, wish or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave,

as it exists in the slave holding states of this Union."

Much time was consumed in the discussion on the above resolutions. Speakers were abundant, and mostly on one side. Much excitement prevailed while the resolutions were pending. For several hours the discussions were confined to the anti-abolitionists. Two members of the New Hampshire Conference had attended an anti-slavery meeting and made a few remarks, at a time when they had no duties to perform, either in conference or committee. *This was the occasion.*

It was proposed to amend the resolutions, by inserting the *names* of the two brethren. Rev. W. A. Smith spoke in favor of the proposition to insert their names. "*Let them*," said he, "*be brought forth in all the length and breadth of their DAMNING INIQUITY!*" But this, it was pretended by others, would expose them to *Lynch law*. Many hints were thrown out about mobs—enough, it was thought, to have created one; especially as not a sentence *against* mobs fell from the lips of a single speaker. As a specimen of these hints, take the following from the speech of Rev. R. Paine, President of La Grange College.

"And even here, in this free state, what would be the consequence, if an abolition meeting were now advertised to be held at the Court-House in this City? If such a thing were projected, even here, you would see the indignant crowd, gathering in the streets, and presenting a dark and dense mass, making its way to the appointed place, to pour out its vengeance on those who might be rash enough to engage in such a scheme."

#### O. SCOTT AND W. WINANS.

But I cannot dwell here. As the reviewer has confined himself principally to the speeches of brother Winans and myself, I must follow him. And in order to give a fair and full view of this part of the discussion, I will insert the whole controversy between brother Winans and myself. My speech against the resolutions comes first in order—then brother Winans' speech, as reported by the editor of the *Philanthropist*—then my review of his arguments, as published in the address to the General Conference; next his attack upon me; and lastly, my defence. I shall then close with a *particular examination* of the "Review of the Proceedings of the late General Conference."

I am sorry that this examination necessarily has so much reference to myself. But it is a solemn duty which I not only owe to myself, but to the cause of truth—to the church, and to the world—to correct some as glaring errors, as ever were perhaps connected with the deliberations of a body of Christian ministers!

#### PERSONAL ABUSE.

The abuse which I have received from a certain quarter, both at the General Conference and since, is, I presume, unparalleled, at least in the annals of Methodism. My character by brethren in high places has been made the sport of every wind. I have been charged by the highest ecclesiastical body of the M. E. Church, and through our official periodicals with "palpable falsehoods," and that too without the forms of trial! This subject was investigated by the conference of which I am a member, immediately after the General Conference, and my character for truth and veracity was pronounced fair and unimpeached, by I believe a unanimous vote; but still those slanders are industriously reiterated and circulated by a certain brother, and a certain press. Have I not *reason* to complain?

#### WHY DID NOT REV. N. BANGS PROVE THE CHARGES.

I ought, perhaps, to have made a full development of this whole subject at an earlier period. But I did not suppose that after it had been investigated by an annual conference, and I had been *fully acquitted*, without receiving even the *least censure*, that I should still be hunted like a fox upon the mountains. I did not suppose that the same brother who had charged me through the columns of the Christian Advocate and Journal soon after the General Conference, with falsehood, and who was immediately notified to appear and sustain the charge, if he saw fit to do so, but who declined, stating in a letter to the Chairman of the Council, that he never *intended* to "charge me with the *sin* of falsehood;" and being himself present at the conference where I was completely acquitted by the votes of anti-abolitionists, as well as abolitionists;—I say, I did think I had reason to expect better things of Rev.

N. Bangs, than that he would continue to publish these slanderous charges against me through the whole length and breadth of the land—and that too in more aggravated forms, misrepresenting my language and ridiculing my arguments, not to say my intellect! Has this brother done by me as he would wish me to do by him? But more of this in another place.

#### THE CHARGES HAVE BEEN MET.

Notwithstanding I have met these charges in my own conference, to the full satisfaction of my brethren, yet, as I am still published to the world as guilty of "palpable falsehoods," and that through the columns of our central official paper, and by a brother extensively known, it becomes my duty to make a solemn appeal to facts and enter into a minute examination of this whole affair. Will you, dear brother, for my sake, and for the sake of truth, give your candid attention to what follows. If I am guilty of palpable falsehoods, I ought not to remain in the Church; but if I am innocent, my innocence ought to appear.

#### ACCUSATIONS.

It is an easy matter to deal out wholesale charges, and support them by declamation, and then, in the excitement of the moment, vote them proved; especially where an offensive cause is to be put down by such means.

It was easy for the Jews to *prefer* and *support* the charge of sedition, against the Saviour of the world. It was an easy matter for the Papists to prove Martin Luther a heretic. It was also easy for the Episcopalians to prove John Wesley a *schismatic* and *fanatic*. And I may add, it was an easy matter for 97 Methodist preachers out of 150 to charge a pamphlet that they did not like, with palpable falsehoods! But with how much reason they did this, will be seen in the sequel.

#### SPEECH OF REV. O. SCOTT.

*Delivered on the floor of the General Conference, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 12 and 13, 1836.*

The following outline of my remarks on the resolution condemning modern abolition, was written out by myself, and published in a pamphlet, entitled "An Address to the General Conference."

It is a mere outline, containing, however, all the principal points, in brief.

Four or five hours had been occupied by our anti-abolition brethren, before any abolitionist spoke at all; but before the resolution passed, we claimed a hearing; and, by the request of the anti-slavery members, I attempted to show what modern abolitionism was, that the Conference might understand what they were about to condemn by the passage of a resolution which was then pending.

#### SIN OF SLAVERY.

"I assumed the position, that the principle of slavery,—the principle which justifies holding and treating the human species as property, is morally wrong,—or, in other words, that it is a *sin*. The principle, I contended, aside from all circumstances, is *evil*, ONLY EVIL, and that CONTINUALLY! I said, no hand could sanctify it—no circumstances could change it from bad to good. It was a reprobate—too bad to be converted—not subject to the law of God, neither indeed, could be. I admitted that circumstances might palliate, and circumstances might aggravate, but no circumstances could justify the *principle*. If any circumstances could justify the right of property in human beings—then we had only to change some of the circumstances with which slavery is connected, and it becomes universally right—so that in that case, the sin would be in the circumstances. The abstract question was argued at considerable length. It was insisted that slavery was morally right or morally wrong, or that it had no moral character. The first and last of these suppositions I considered *absurd*; and contended, that 'He who has made of one blood, all nations of men to dwell on the earth,' must look with *disapprobation* upon such a system of complicated wrongs, as American slavery.

"I then attempted to show, that such views of slavery among Methodists, and Methodist ministers, are not 'modern,' by extracts from Wesley, Clarke, our fathers in this country—and our brethren on the other side the Atlantic. And these quotations show, that clear, plain, pointed denunciations of slavery, are not peculiar to 'modern abolitionism.' [The quotations are here omitted.]

#### IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.

"I next proceeded to show, that if slavery be a *sin*, as I contended it was, it ought of course to be immediately abandoned. The abolitionists mean, by immediate emancipation, the *immediate cessation of the right assumed of property in man*. Not turning the slaves loose upon community, to roam at large without law—but the placing them under good and wholesome laws. They are not now known in law except as goods and chattels—let them be emancipated *into law*.

"Immediate emancipation is not, as some have supposed, an amalgamation of the whites and blacks. There is too much of this already: we would prevent it—but should we cease to lift up our voice against the most cruel oppression through a fear that should slavery be abolished, some white woman might, at some distant period, happen to marry a black man?

"Immediate emancipation does not necessarily imply the investment of the slaves with equal political privileges with the whites; though it is believed that it would be difficult to show why the color of a man's skin should deprive him of his civil or political rights;—yet this is another question.

"The slaves may be free in a *good sense*, though not admitted immediately to equal political rights. In the state of Rhode Island, though a man be worth a hundred thousand dollars, yet, if he does not possess real estate to the amount of one hundred and fifty dollars, he is not admitted to the polls; and yet we never supposed this a *state of slavery*?

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

"The abolitionists, in common with most of their fellow-citizens, believe that our general government has the power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories; and that, if slavery be *sin*, it is a sin for which every citizen of the United States is responsible! But Congress will not abolish slavery till the people call for it; and the people will not call for it, till they feel it to be wrong; and they will not feel it to be wrong till they investigate it.

"Hence the propriety and necessity of discussion.

"All right to legislate upon the sub-

ject of slavery in the slave States belongs exclusively to the legislators of those States. The general government has no authority to interfere with the political relations of master and slave in the slave States.

"The abolitionists would not countenance any resort, by the slaves, to physical force to obtain their freedom on any account. They have been accused of trying to get up insurrections among the slaves; but *it is FALSE!* We do indeed believe that any citizen of the world has a right to oppose *any sin, wherever it may exist, even though it be legalized.* If therefore slavery be sin, it is not only our privilege, but our solemn duty, to oppose it.

"We find it very convenient to apologize for the present race of slave holders, by saying slavery was entailed upon us when we were British colonies; but we are unwilling to receive any aid from England in getting rid of it. 'It is a very delicate subject; and one with which foreigners must not intermeddle!'

"Slavery will never be abolished by peaceful measures till the subject shall have been freely and fully discussed; and that discussion, as a matter of course, must commence in the North. It cannot be discussed in the South; we must therefore discuss it in the North, or not at all. But there are no slaves in the North! True; but there are 26,000 in the District of Columbia, and in the Territories. [Arkansas was then a Territory.]

"Mr. President, we think we can judge as correctly respecting the character of slavery in the *abstract*, as slave holders can. Nay; it is reasonable to suppose we should be less likely to err than they; for we have no interest at stake. It is more difficult to judge correctly where interest is involved. It is not a very easy matter to see through a *silver dollar!*

"Neither the rum-seller, or the drunkard is the best qualified to judge of the sin of intemperance; nor are these the persons to commence a temperance reformation!

#### DUTY OF MINISTERS AND CHRISTIANS.

"As ministers and Christians, we ought to oppose this 'crying evil.' In it, our church and our ministers are

deeply involved. The groanings of the prisoner call loudly for our prayers and our exertions. It is a happy circumstance, that the leaders in this discussion are generally ministers of the Gospel, who, in point of politics, have nothing to hope or fear. And while we disclaim all intention to interfere with the political relation of master and slave in the slave States, we will not cease to preach against this *great evil*, because the laws of the slave holding States sanction it; nor because the power of moral suasion may become so strong as to lead the people of the North to elect such representatives to Congress as will vote for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and in the territories. We mean to lift up our voice like a trumpet, and show the inhabitants of this land their sins!

"We know it is an 'exciting subject,' but we have yet to learn that a good cause should be abandoned because it produces excitement.

"Moses and Aaron produced excitement in the court of Pharaoh, when they contended for the rights and liberties of the Israelites;—when our fathers asserted their liberties, and threw off the British yoke, it produced *great excitement.*

"The reformation under Luther, was a very exciting subject. When the seeds of Methodism were first sown, both in Europe and America, the whole community were excited. The temperance discussion has produced great excitement in various parts of our country; and every revival of religion excites and irritates the community more or less. We have never dreamed that so great a change could take place in our country as the abolition of slavery, without great excitement. When the 'craft' of men is in danger, they will be excited.

#### DIVISION OF THE UNION.

"But, if the North do not give up this discussion, the Union will be divided.' Who will divide it? The North will not do this; and what have the South to gain by it? [If the South divide the Union, they lose, at that moment, all northern support in case of insurrection: their safety now consists in their union with the North. Let the South divide the Union, and make a war upon the North,—they must support it



either with white or colored soldiers. If they march their white men against the North, who will take care of their women and children left in the hands of the slaves at home? If they arm their slaves, and march them out to fight the abolitionists, who will guaranty their allegiance to their master's cause? If the Union is divided, will the line of division be impassable! Will not the servant be free from his master the moment he steps across the line? Can the division of the Union keep anti-slavery publications out of the South? And the moment the Union is divided, will not the entire North, both church and state, be abolitionists? Is it not the union of the States, and of the church, which keeps up a spirit of slavery in the North, and will the *South* sever that cord which binds to them their *northern apologists*? No, sir, never; unless they wish to *hasten emancipation*. They may *threaten*, as they have ever been in the habit of doing, but that will be all. They can never be so blind to their own interests as to divide the Union for the sake of destroying abolitionists? This would only add new fury to the 'unhallowed flame,' as the brother from Baltimore calls it.] But, Mr. President, if abolitionism is *constitutional*, what pretext is there for a division of the Union? I take the ground, sir, that we are protected by the Constitution of the United States. Let us look at this subject for a moment. And, 1. The Constitution recognizes the existence of slavery. 2. It permits continuance. 3. It secures servants to their masters, *wherever* they are found, if demanded. But, 4. It does not *enjoin* slavery as a *duty*. 5. It does not *prohibit* emancipation. And, lastly, It *guaranties* the freedom of speech, and of the press, and the right of petition. Will the South divide the Union, because we in the North are pursuing a constitutional course?

#### PEACE OF THE CHURCH.

"But it is said that this abolition discussion is not conducive to the peace of the church. Suppose this were admitted;—are there no interests to be consulted beside the peace of the church? It may not, perhaps, be always best, that the church be at peace. There may be 'ease in Zion,' connected with a 'wedge

of gold and a Babylonish garment.' The Methodist Episcopal Church has an unholy alliance with slavery; she ought not, therefore, to give herself any peace till she cleanses the skirts of her garments from 'blood guiltiness!' Shall the dearest interests of *undying millions* be sacrificed upon the altar of the peace of the church? But the church will be divided. And what will divide it? The church is built upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. If, therefore, abolition is from *beneath*, the church is safe; for the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And if abolition is from above, (of which I have no more doubt than of the truths of Christianity,) it will never harm the church. All *future* consequences to the Union and the church, are, at best, *imaginary*. They may be realized, and they may not. Shall we then suffer *imaginary consequences* to determine our duty, when we have a more unerring rule? Had we always acted on this principle, where would the temperance reformation, and many other important enterprises, have been? Imaginary consequences are a new standard of duty for a body of Christian ministers, and very unbecoming in the nineteenth century.

#### THE UNHALLOWED FLAME.

"I come now, Mr. President, to notice a few things which were stated on the floor of this Conference yesterday, and then I have done. An aged and venerable brother from Baltimore, called the abolition excitement an 'unhallowed flame'—and this expression he has several times repeated on this floor. Now, sir, this *same* unhallowed flame has burnt off the chains from 600,000 goods and chattels in the West India islands, and elevated them to the rank of human beings! Abolitionism is one in all parts of the world. We are not trying an experiment—we are walking in a beaten track. Our principles have been fully tested and we have no fears as to the final results. The day of our national jubilee may linger, but it will come at last—and it cannot tarry long! Had it not been for the abolitionists, the 600,000 colored freemen in the West India Islands, had still been goods and chattels! And do you ask what the abolitionists have done? Let the 600,000

goods and chattels metamorphosed into peaceable, industrious and happy freemen, answer the question! Let a ship load of *fifty-nine tons* of Bibles testify to the good effects of emancipation! Through the influence of this 'unhallowed flame,' some scores of slaves have been set at liberty in this country. A gentleman in this city has emancipated his slaves, through the influence of abolition doctrines. The fires of abolition are now burning deep and wide—the heaven of liberty is now working through the whole lump—and the axe is laid at the root of the tree—the whole country is awake, and the day of our redemption is at hand!

#### PUBLIC OPINION.

"The *impropriety* of attempting to brave public opinion has been suggested on this floor. But, sir, if public opinion is wrong, it ought to be braved.—Shall truth and righteousness succumb to public opinion without stopping to inquire whether that public opinion is right or wrong? If public opinion is wrong, let it be set right—and in order to this, let it be braved by a firm adherence to right principles! However few in number the advocates of truth may be, let them not swerve the breadth of a hair from right principles! Let there be no compromise between truth and error.

"Public opinion was against Daniel, when he was commanded not to pray for thirty days, but he braved it—and in defiance of the king's decree, continued to pray with his windows open towards Jerusalem. Public opinion was against the three Hebrews, when they refused to worship the 'golden image,' and to obey laws which infringed upon the rights of conscience. They braved public opinion, and stood it out against the stern decree of the king! Did they do right? The apostles braved public opinion in every place where they planted the standard of the cross. Martin Luther and his followers did the same at the risk of their lives! John Wesley and his coadjutors in England, braved public opinion. When Mr. Wesley was expelled from the churches, he preached in grave-yards, public markets, and open fields! And though public opinion commanded Mr. Wesley to desist

through the medium of *mobs*—still he stood it out! Shame on his *compromising sons*! The Methodists in all parts of the United States have braved, and finally, to a considerable extent, *changed* public opinion. Every man's hand has been against us, and yet we have stood firm. But now comes up the new doctrine of *compromise*!! Let it be banished from the breast of every patriot, philanthropist and Christian. The advocates of temperance have *braved* and *changed* public opinion. The same may be said of Wilberforce, and the English abolitionists. And with all these examples before us, shall we succumb to an unholy public opinion, founded in the *love of gain*? Shall we turn our backs upon the cause of suffering humanity, because public opinion frowns upon us? *No! NEVER!!*

#### ABOLITIONISM CANNOT BE PUT DOWN.

"Mr. President, Rev. J. A. Collins has told us that he came up here flush with the expectation, 'that the brethren from the North would put their foot on abolitionism, and crush it.' And have we yet to learn, sir, that free discussion is not to be put down in this way? When you can put your foot on one of the burning mountains and smother its fires—when you can roll back the current of the thundering falls of the Niagara—or stop the sun in its course, you may then begin to think about 'crushing abolitionism!' *Sir, the die is cast*—the days of the captivity of our country *are numbered*! THEIR REDEMPTION IS WRITTEN IN HEAVEN!!

"Any action which this Conference may take on this subject—will give to abolitionism both strength and stability. It cannot be voted down,—it cannot be persecuted down—it has braved public opinion and mob-law too long to think of yielding now to *votes of censure*.—Any resolutions you may pass, for or against abolitionism, will bring it into notice, and set it on a higher and firmer foundation. The resolutions of this Conference may retard the emancipation of the slaves, but they cannot check abolition. If you would not contribute to the permanency and spread of abolitionism, you had better practice on the suggestion of the brother from Ohio, (Rev. D. Young,) and 'not touch it

with your tongues.' This he tells us has been *his* course. But let it be remembered that these are the men who are to sit as our judges—men, who, in point of examination, and a knowledge of what they condemn, have not so much as touched it with their tongues—and yet they are prepared to express their 'unqualified' disapprobation of that of which they acknowledge their *entire ignorance!* O, how strangely have we departed from the footsteps of our fathers!

#### MOBS.

Several of the speakers yesterday alluded to mobs—and expressed their fears for the personal safety of the two brethren who attended the abolition meeting last Tuesday—but *not a word fell from their lips in condemnation of mobs! No! Not a syllable!!* Sir, we are assured by the citizens of this place, that there will be no mob, *unless the General Conference get it up!* I hope for the honor of the Conference, that we shall hear no more suggestions of this kind. Such suggestions, through the press and otherwise, have been the means of getting up the mobs which have so recently disgraced various parts of our country.

#### THE BISHOP DRIVEN FROM THE CHAIR.

You have also been told, that one of our bishops, was, last year, almost driven from the chair, that the Conference might be turned into an abolition meeting. This, sir, is a very great mistake. The facts in the case are these. The N. H. Conference at its last session appointed a committee on slavery—that committee reported—a motion was made to adopt the report—and the Bishop refused to put the motion, stating as his reason, that he did not think the adoption of the report would tend to the peace of the church. A motion was then made to go into a committee of the whole—the Bishop after a moment's reflection said, that it would be in order for the Conference to do so. The Conference then went into a committee of the whole, and adopted the report by a vote of 59 to 8—the Bishop leaving the chair, and calling another brother to take it. So much for driving the Bishop from the chair, and turning the Conference into an abolition meeting!"

The following is Br. Winans' reply to the foregoing, as reported by the editor of the Philanthropist. The correctness of this report Br. Winans did not question. He quoted from this document to prove some of my statements incorrect, without once intimating that this report was incorrect in any particular. That part of it which he has incorporated into his *printed speech*, is to be considered, on Rev. N. Bang's principles of reasoning, *as his own language!*

#### REV. W. WINANS' SPEECH.

Mr. Winans said, "that he did not intend to confine his remarks to the first resolution—he would reply directly to Br. Scott's argument. He would preface what he had to say by a few remarks, which might appear egotistical. He was from the extreme South. He arose with perfect calmness, without agitation, without a single angry feeling towards any brother. But occupying the situation he did, feeling his responsibility to his God, to the Church, and to the interests of humanity, he could not be without strong emotion.

#### SLAVERY A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

"He would meet the brother on the fundamental ground of his argument—would examine his strong moral views of slavery. It had been assumed, that slavery was wrong in *some* circumstances, in *no* circumstances, or in *all* circumstances. Now he designed to prove from the brother's own admission, that slavery was right in *all* circumstances. Jehovah had permitted—had regulated slavery; would he permit—would he regulate that which was morally wrong? Could there be a blinding influence, strong enough to induce any one to charge God with sanctioning crime? It would be needless to refer to particular scriptures; but many passages did exist which established beyond controversy that God did permit *perpetual—hereditary* slavery. This admitted, it was plain, that circumstances might deprive slavery of an immoral character. He would have opposed slavery in its *origin*. It was as clear as the morning sun that slavery in the abstract is wrong. But is it wrong now in the Southern States? This is the point in dispute between abolitionists and *anti-abolitionists*. Have we not seen, that circumstances justified it in the case of the Hebrews? If circumstances *can* justify it, he thought they existed in the South. Another question would arise—ought Christians to endeavor to change these circumstances. He had no doubt they ought—that it was *obligatory* on them to do so. But was the course of abolitionists right? Clearly not. It was most unpropitious, most injudicious—and calculated to effect precisely what was most opposite to their purposes.

#### SLAVE HOLDER FROM PRINCIPLE.

"He was not born in a slave State,—he was a Pennsylvanian by birth. He had been brought up to believe a slave holder as great a villain as a horse thief; but he had gone to the South, &c.—long residence there had changed

his views; he had become a slave holder—a slave holder on *principle*. There was suspicion abroad in the South. To obviate such suspicion and gain free access to the slave, so as to do him good, it was highly advantageous for a minister that he himself should hold slaves; and he could see no impropriety, but advantage, in members, preachers, presiding elders, and even bishops, being slave holders. Yes, said Mr. W. however novel the sentiment may be, however startling it may be to many, I avow this opinion boldly, and without any desire to conceal it.

"The brother admitted that Congress had no power of legislation on slavery in the States. The only influence, therefore, abolitionism could exert, was moral in its character—must be exerted over mind. Now the legislatures of the slave States only, could abolish slavery; therefore this moral influence must be exerted on them. He affirmed, that abolition, in its influence on those bodies, was directly opposite to that which its friends designed. For the ten years preceding the last three years, there was a constantly increasing disposition to meliorate the condition of the slave. The abolition excitement was got up. In one moment, a paralysis was felt in every nerve of the South—in all those influences, looking to the emancipation of the slave. Though a slave holder himself, no abolitionist felt more sympathy for the slave than he did—none had rejoiced more in the hope of a coming period, when the print of a slave's foot would not be seen on the soil. His heart sank within him when he contemplated the incendiary influences of abolition. They were incendiary, for they had kindled a flame upon the dearest hopes of the African.

#### MURDERED WIVES—BURNING HOUSES.

"He and his brethren in the *South* were to act on this question—not *others* for them. Abolition was considered a murderous scheme at the South—[here the speaker became so rapid and vehement, that we found it impossible to note accurately what he said. We remember, however, that his fruitful imagination pictured 'murdered wives,' 'massacred children,' 'burning towns,' 'cities and habitations rendered desolate,' 'slaves freed to be impoverished, to starve, to die,'—consequences which it was believed would result from the success of abolition doctrines.] Southern legislatures, he said, would never listen to such doctrines—they were deaf, they would be deaf as an adder. The South already looked upon the people of the North as their enemies—thirsting for their blood. A few knew that the body of the North was opposed to such schemes—regarded them as fanatical. And the most favorable view he could take of abolitionists was, that they were carried away by fanaticism.

"The brother had said, that abolitionism had an intimate connection with our missionary operations. It had; but in a very different sense from what the brother meant. He would state a case to illustrate his views. A brother was sent last year to a circuit on the Mississippi coast, comprising three parishes. No sooner were the abolition movements known at the North, than public meetings were called in two of the parishes, and it was decided in them that Methodist preachers should preach no more; because two Conferences in the North had

avowed themselves in favor of abolition. The third parish was not so hasty—had a little more common sense. A public meeting was called in this, but owing to the influence of one man, no such prohibitory measure was adopted. This man pledged his honor, his property—his life, in defence of the purity of the preacher's character and motives, and he was allowed to preach amongst them. In the two parishes where so violent measures were taken, the most of the residents were slaves—and preachers had never before been questioned. Let abolitionists proceed, and they would effect nothing better in the South. In the North they might raise a flame and call it a holy flame, but in the South it would be the fire of hell.

#### TWO KINDS OF FATHERS.

"Methodists had two sets of fathers—one set abolitionists. Bishop Asbury's name had been introduced. Bishop Asbury, before his death, was decidedly an anti-abolitionist. Bishop Asbury at first was a believer in the doctrines of abolition, and he acted on the belief. Experience convinced him of his error, and his course was changed. It would be amusing, were not the subject so important, to hear brethren talk of the great additional light of modern times. They had said it was too late in the day to put back this question. They supposed a flood of light had been poured on this subject. The modesty of brethren was great. The fathers of Methodism were thrown into the shade by the increased light of this day. The speaker declared emphatically;—'from the North or Great Britain, we will not receive, we do not want, aid or advice to help us to rid ourselves of slavery. We will sit in judgment on our own case, we will follow our own course.' He would not censure the North for its high assumptions. Neither Great Britain nor the North, however, occupied positions from which they could help the South. The greatest service they could do it, was to let it alone. The question was a political question with which none but the South had any thing to do.

"In the sight of Heaven this was their only proper course. It was important to the interests of slaves, and in view of the question of slavery, that there be Christians, who were slave holders. Christian ministers should be slave holders, and diffused throughout the South. Yes, sir, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, should be slave holders—yes, he repeated it boldly, there should be members, and *Deacons*, and *Elders*, and *BISHOPS* too, who were *slave holders*. For if slave holding were a valid reason for excluding a man from office, it was a valid reason for excluding him from membership. The South *should* be heard—should lose nothing from him. Hear it or not—that was not his concern, it was the concern of the Conference.

#### THE TWO BRETHREN.

"He did not wish to be misunderstood in relation to the first resolution. There was great indelicacy, great indecorum, great disrespect to the Conference, to the city, to public opinion—in the conduct of the brethren, proposed to be censured. He had no doubt as to the propriety of censure. They merited reprehension. Abolition movements should be reprehended; for

they were evil, and only evil, always and every where. It had been insinuated that he wanted milk and water resolutions. This was, as to himself, a novel accusation. He had commonly been charged with two much boldness—too much severity, but never before accused in this fashion. He knew not how much animal courage he might possess—but to moral and political courage he avowed his claim. Indeed, a distinguished politician of the South said of him, that he would make an excellent politician, only he had too much candor. His character must indeed be essentially changed, if he could keep back the truth, to conciliate the good opinion of any."

#### REVIEW OF THE FOREGOING.

My review of the foregoing Speech follows next. Look out for the *palpable falsehoods!* This is the same that was contained in my Address to the General Conference, which has produced so much excitement, and brought down upon me the cruel and unfounded charges of "palpable falsehoods!"

"Rev. W. Winans stated that slavery was a divine institution—and must of course be right. God, said he, has instituted perpetual, hereditary slavery—and therefore it is right under all circumstances. If circumstances ever did exist sufficient to justify slavery aside from revelation, then American slavery might be justified. But, 1. I deny that God ever did institute perpetual hereditary slavery. 2. I deny that there is any Scripture authority for American slavery; or, indeed, for any other slavery at the present time. 3. I deny that there are any circumstances in our country which can justify slavery. And if Mr. Wesley is right, then every slave holder is a *man stealer*. He says it is 'impossible that any child of man should ever be *born a slave*.' Now there are 60,000 children born of female slaves yearly—and if they are in the sight of God, as Mr. Wesley has said, *born free*—then there are so many children *stolen* yearly in our country, and reduced to slavery.

#### SLAVES TREATED WORSE.

"Brother Winans next stated, that the abolitionists were shutting the door of the Gospel against the slaves—that their movements made the planters very jealous, that in one or two instances missionaries had been turned away—and finally, he thought the movements of the abolitionists were injuring the slave. Now if it were true, that the discussion of this great doctrine of human rights stirs up in some few instances the bad passions of men, to increase oppression, yet this fact alone is not sufficient proof that the cause should be abandoned. This reasoning would have defeated the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage—and our fathers from the British yoke. The present generation of slaves are not alone concerned, and especially the *few* who may be more severely treated, in consequence of the movements of the present day. It is a question connected with the dearest interests of millions now on the stage, and of generations to come. I am fully of the opinion, that there are more

instances where the slaves are treated better in consequence of the abolition movements, than there are where they are treated worse. A slave holder was asked, not long since in the city of New York, whether the abolition movements were operating unfavorably upon the treatment of the slaves? He said, 'No! We are obliged to treat them better; for now every eye and ear is open—we are more narrowly watched than we used to be.' But I will not insist that they are better treated, neither do I believe that in general they are worse treated. But admitting that all the objections which have been urged to abolition are true, still the great question to be decided, is, whether slavery be sin or not. If it be sin, the path of duty before every Christian is plain. The promulgation of the doctrines of the Reformation were connected with the shedding of blood; but had Luther been influenced by the modern doctrine of *expediency*, where should we have been? Had the signers and defenders of the Declaration of Independence been under the influence of this principle of *expediency*, where would our liberties have now been.

"I fear we have nearly lost sight of slavery, except as it exists in the Methodist Episcopal Church! And it appears to me, that we are almost ready to sacrifice the rights and liberties of millions of human beings, to a few local circumstances connected with some of our own missions to the slaves! Do we not limit our views of this great evil to our own Church! Let us lift up our eyes, and look on the fields which were once dyed with the blood of liberty, but now covered with tyranny and oppression!

#### MURDERED FAMILIES—BURNING HOUSES.

"Brother Winans proceeded:—

"Abolitionism is an incendiary flame. It is insurrectionary—and in the carrying out of these measures we in the South can see through murdered wives and children, and burning houses, &c. If this were not a serious matter, it would be not a little amusing to reflect, that at this late period, ministers of the Gospel will indulge in such flights of imagination, on such subjects!

"If there never had been any slaves emancipated, or if such effects had ever followed emancipation, these representations would not appear so utterly groundless. But slaves have been emancipated by *hundreds of thousands*, at different times and in different places. And where have murdered wives and children, and burning houses ever followed? It is now too late in the day to produce much effect by such representations. There are too many facts in existence upon this subject. The experiment has been often tried—and it has never failed—no, not in a single instance. Oppression, not emancipation, will produce insurrections. The slave longs for freedom—and will he kill his master for bestowing upon him that which he ardently desires? *Never!* I know some have supposed that the emancipation in St. Domingo was followed by murdered families and burning houses! but this is a very great mistake. There were in the French part of the Island of St. Domingo 600,000 slaves suddenly emancipated in the year 1793. It was a time of civil war—the arrival of a British armament was daily expected. The emancipation of the slaves was the only

alternative—the only possible way of saving the island—and this a very doubtful experiment, at best. But it worked well. The slaves joined with the whites, in opposing the common enemy. No white inhabitant of the island was injured, unless he had first put himself in the attitude of a political enemy, by siding with the British. Not a wife, nor a child was murdered, nor a building burned. The emancipated slaves remained quiet, and were industrious, till Bonaparte, in 1802, through one of his generals, attempted to re-establish slavery in the island. It was then, that those who had been free and happy for nine years, resisted unto blood. Thus it will be seen, that it was *slavery*, and not emancipation, which gave rise to the bloody scenes of St. Domingo.

“But let it be remembered, 1. That there were about 42,000 whites—44,000 free colored people—and 600,000 slaves in the Island.—2. Slavery was abolished under the most unfavorable outward circumstances; a time of civil war. What an excellent opportunity this, for the slaves to have butchered their masters—especially as they were so much more numerous than the whites.—3. Those slaves were emancipated suddenly, without a moment's warning, or any kind of preparation. And yet the experiment was perfectly safe.

#### WEST INDIES.

“Br. Winans' cry of murdered wives and children, and burning houses, is not *new*. The West India planters, and their apologists, throughout the kingdom of Great Britain, when the subject of abolition was first agitated in the British Parliament, raised this same bloody cry, *long and loud*; and they continued it from year to year. ‘Out throats will be cut, and our buildings will be burned.’ So they said, and so many believed. But what has been the result. Let the Antigua newspaper, together with an eye and ear witness, answer the question. The above named paper of the 7th of August, 1834, speaks thus:—

“The great doubt is solved—the alarming prognostications of the advocates of slavery falsified—the highest hopes of the negro's friends fulfilled, and their pledge honorably redeemed. A whole people, comprising 30,000 souls, have passed from slavery into freedom, not only without the slightest irregularity, but with the solemn and decorous tranquillity of the Sabbath. A week has nearly elapsed, and although all eyes and ears are open, and reports spread rapidly, we have not heard of a single act of insolence, insubordination or violence committed by any one of them, under false and licentious notions of freedom.’

“From the same paper, of the 15th August: ‘It is with the highest satisfaction we announce, that we know of, and believe, that there is no gang of laborers in the island, which has not returned to its accustomed employment.’

“So that two weeks after the slaves were ‘let loose,’ instead of begging and stealing, they were all quietly at work.

“We quote from the same paper of the 21st August:

“The third week of freedom will close with this day, and again we are bound to express our gratitude and praise to the Divine goodness, for the perfect peace and tranquillity

which the island enjoys. Not the least symptom of insubordination has manifested itself any where; and the daily accounts from all quarters testify to the excellent disposition and conduct of the new freemen.’

“In a letter from Antigua, dated 30th August, and published in a Norfolk paper, we find the following:

“The operations of commerce have experienced no interruption; public confidence remains unshaken. Two sugar plantations have recently leased for as much as they were worth, with the negroes included, prior to emancipation.’

#### MORE FACTS.

“A few days since, [says the editor of the New York Evangelist] we had the pleasure of a call from an old and respected acquaintance, formerly a respectable attorney in Vermont, now a merchant in the island of Barbadoes, where he has resided most of the time since September, 1834. His character as a Christian and a man of observation, renders his remarks and statements worthy of entire confidence. We took some notes of his conversation, during the hour he had to spare to us, between the time of his arrival here, and his departure to visit his family, after so long a separation; and from these notes we have prepared the following sketch, every particular of which corresponds, we believe, with the statements he made.

“The Island of Barbadoes is one of the most populous portions of the earth. The inhabitants are reckoned to be at least 120,000 on an island not more than twenty-one miles long, and twelve broad at the extremity. Of these, it is estimated that 80,000 were slaves, before the abolition act took effect, August 1st, 1834; and 20,000, free people of color.

“As to the effects of emancipation upon the public safety, they now laugh at the idea of fear. They are talking of reducing their military force. Ask them if they are not afraid the blacks will rise and cut their master's throats, they reply, ‘What should they do that for, when they have got all they wanted?’ The free blacks are organized into militia.

“Many who opposed the abolition of slavery, step by step to the last, are now in favor of it. They say it has been a good thing for the Island. All their fears in regard to evil consequences have been disappointed.

“The capitol, Bridgetown, is very populous, the inhabitants from 10 to 12,000, but our informant had never known sufficient disturbance to occasion a person to walk forty rods to see it. There is vice enough, to be sure, but no combination of the vicious to disturb the public peace. He could lie down to sleep there, out of doors, as quietly as in any place in New England.

“There is no general complaint of the want of labor. The crops are got in as usual. The blacks will work for pay on their own day, and extra hours, as readily and as much, as ignorant and depraved white people would, when paid for it. They act just as other people would do in similar circumstances. It is a common remark, that a negro goes on an errand quicker and loiters less, how he is paid, than when he was a slave.

## AMALGAMATION.

"As to the fear that abolishing slavery will lead to amalgamation, our friend avers that it operates precisely the other way, to separate the two races. Amalgamation has had its full run there, under the reign of slavery. You may go into a church now, and see 250 persons at a time, of whom you cannot determine confidently whether they are white or colored. It has been a common thing there for white men to keep colored women. Even married men did it. Every body says this is becoming now far less common, and the colored women who used to be kept as concubines of white men, are now getting colored husbands. It takes the minister in the cathedral at Bridgetown, a quarter of an hour to publish the bans of marriage.

"The effect of abolition on the financial condition of the country is quite remarkable. Our informant says that real estate is rising, for the last six months has risen rapidly, in many instances has risen one third in a year. If persons had bought real estate two years ago, great fortunes might have been made. The consumption of dry goods has also wonderfully increased, and dealers in dry goods are making fortunes. The negroes now dress like other people. Some years ago, if a colored woman had been seen in the streets wearing a straw bonnet, it would have been almost a signal for a mob; now they dress as well as any people of their standing. The imports generally are doubled. A very great increase has taken place in the importation of American productions. The blacks begin to live like human beings. The importations were never so great as the last year.

## CHANGE OF FEELING.

"The change of feeling on the subject of abolition is entire. Our friend was surprised on his first arrival to hear the subject so freely spoken of, immediately after the act took effect. He supposed he should have to talk carefully and in whispers, as at the South. The papers are beginning to publish in favor of the act. While it was talked of, the people and the papers were violent and furious against it. After the 1st of August, seeing no disturbance, they began to congratulate each other. Now they are coming round entirely, and already begin to reproach America for continuing the system of slavery. This change does not seem to have arisen from any new views of slavery as a sin; but from what they see of the effects of abolition, they are satisfied it is a great benefit. And they say it will come to the same result in America, whenever abolition takes place.—Said our friend, 'I felt ashamed of my country, to hear it reproached for the absurdity, and inconsistency, and sin of slavery, and I could make no reply. Here among our own people, one does not feel it so much; but when we get abroad, we feel it keenly.'

"It is not the case that the negroes become impudent towards the whites, in consequence of emancipation. On the contrary, it is universally said that they are more civil than they used to be.

"In short, one only needs to see the West Indies to be convinced of the safety and utility of abolishing slavery. The experiment of emancipation has already gone on long enough

to prove that negroes are like other people; if you give them their rights they are grateful, and have sense enough to see that it is now for their interest to support the laws, and that if they make disturbance they punish only themselves.

"Many other instances of emancipation might be brought forward—and much more might be said of the good effects in those cases which are here adduced. But it is unnecessary. The arguments in favor of immediate emancipation are bright as noon day. To take the opposite side of this important question, at *this time*, shows either a lack of knowledge, or a *fixed loze of slavery!* The perfect safety of immediate emancipation, under almost any circumstances, is now placed beyond all reasonable doubt. There is nothing wanting but a *disposition*.

## REV. W. WINANS AND FREEDOM.

"Br. WINANS told us that 'no abolitionist in the land would be more glad to see the slaves free than himself—and yet he tells us slavery is a Divine institution—that is right under all circumstances. And he furthermore, tells us, that Christians, Ministers, and even Bishops ought to be slave holders—and slave holders ought to labor under no disadvantages—they ought to be eligible to all the offices within the gift of the church.'

"Now how Br. Winans can believe that slavery is of Divine origin—that it is *right*, that Bishops ought to be slave holders—and yet be as glad to have slavery done away as any abolitionist in the land, I cannot conceive! It appears to me to imply an inconsistency, to say the least. I perceived that Br. Winans had his difficulties in defending slavery—and in reconciling it with moral principles. I am not surprised that his speech makes rather *bad joints!* There are few who could have done better, from the same premises. In this *brother*, the cause of slavery has both *ingenuity* and *zeal*. I admired the bold and uncompromising attitude which the brother assumed, but was sorry he had not a better cause.

"If Br. Winans would be as glad to have his slaves free as any abolitionist, he will set them at liberty immediately after reaching home. 'O! but the laws forbid it.' Well, suppose the laws should forbid his praying?

## BISHOPS OUGHT TO BE SLAVE HOLDERS.

"Ministers, Christians, and Bishops should be slave holders! Why? Because they will be kind to the slaves; they will set a good example. So then we ought, according to this doctrine, to have Christian rum-sellers, to keep the traffic from being *abused*—and to set a *good example* to other rum-sellers. And we ought also to have Christian robbers and thieves, that they may set a good example to the craft—and so produce a *good influence* on those who are immoral! I beg to take different ground. Neither Bishops, Ministers, or Christians, should be slave holders. Let all these good men come out from these abominations. It is the example of good men, more than any thing else which keeps the system alive. While such good men as Dr. Capers, W. Winans, T. Crowder and others, hold slaves, and treat them *well*, bad men will hold them, and treat

them *crudely*. These good slave holders are the shield and covering of the bad ones. They meet you at every turn and corner. You cannot speak of slavery, or the evils of slavery, but these *good men* stand right up before you. I will not wish them in heaven, as Br. Smith did Br. Scott the other day—but I believe it would be better for the cause of bleeding humanity if this wretched system could not plead the *example* of any *Christian* or *Christian Minister*! A Christian rum-seller does more harm to the cause of temperance than a dozen infidels! You have all heard of deacon Giles, of Salem, Mass., the *rum-maker*. Every unprincipled rum-seller and manufacturer in the land, will plead in justification of his conduct, the example of deacon Giles. And the influence of Christians, and Christian Ministers, on the subject of slavery, is in my humble opinion equally pernicious.

#### DECEITFULNESS OF SLAVERY.

"The speaker told us, that he was formerly from a free state—that he had become a slave holder, and felt justified in so doing—that Bishop Asbury was a warm abolitionist when he first came to this country, but that he cooled off, and changed his views somewhat, before he died. All this only strengthens my conviction, that slavery is 'deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked'—'that if it were possible it would deceive even the very elect.' But this no more proves 'hat slavery is right, than the fact that a great many men who were *once temperate*, but have become drunkards, proves that *drunkenness is right*!

Br. W. affirmed, that the South would not receive any help either from England or the northern states, in getting rid of slavery, i. e. in plain English, they love slavery so well, that they are determined to hold on upon it in spite of all opposition—and yet they would rejoice if the negroes were free! *Put this and that together.*"

#### CHARGE OF FALSEHOOD.

The second day after the above review of Rev. Mr. Winan's speech, (which was included in the address to the General Conference,) was circulated among the members, he introduced, just before the Conference adjourned, the following resolution, supported by the annexed speech, which he read from a manuscript. He remarked before reading the resolution, that he was sure it would be interesting to all.

I have interspersed some notes, included in brackets, for the purpose of calling the reader's attention to some important errors, in the *proper connection*. More extended remarks on this speech will be found in my defence on the floor of the General Conference, and in my examination of the "Review of the proceedings of the General Conference."

"*Resolved, &c., That a pamphlet, circulated among the members of this Conference, purporting to be, 'An Address to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church; By a member of that body,' containing reports of the discussion on modern abolitionism, palpably false, and calculated to make an impression to the injury of the characters of some of the members engaged in the aforesaid discussion, is an outrage on the dignity of this body, and meriting unqualified reprehension.*" The resolution was signed by Mr. Winans, above mentioned, and by Mr. Stamper, of Kentucky.

#### SPEECH OF REV. WILLIAM WINANS.

"Mr. President—I move this resolution with a feeling of humiliation, of which I never was conscious on any former occasion. [Well he might feel *ashamed* to charge a brother with 'palpable falsehood' *without cause*!] I move it in the presence of a body of intelligent men, whose high regard for moral principle must make them sharers in the same feeling. This resolution, sir, goes to charge a *Methodist preacher*, [and yet he afterwards said, in order to insure the passage of the resolution, that the *motives* of the author were not to be impeached; it was only the pamphlet that was to be condemned; and when he knew who this Methodist preacher *was*, he refused to charge him by name!] a representative of an Annual Conference, a member of this General Conference, with falsehood, with injurious falsehood, in circumstances which render it an outrage upon the dignity of the conference, and which deserves the solemn, unqualified reprehension of this venerable assembly. There is but one supposition on which we can escape from the humiliating feeling which oppresses us, and that is, that some reckless, unprincipled writer, has usurped the signature in the title page of the pamphlet to which the resolution has reference. Would to heaven that it could be made to appear that this is the case! It would rescue this General Conference from the odium of numbering among its members one of the most reckless, disregarding truth and even the mere seeming of that virtue, that ever dishonored the name of man or minister. Yes, there is yet one other supposition on which this odium may be *palliated*,—that the writer, though a member of this conference, is *non compos mentis*.

"Sir, there are *many* falsehoods in the pamphlet indicated in the resolution; and it must be confessed, that if the writer be mad, there is method in his madness, for all those falsehoods are calculated for effect with all the precision of cunning malignity. I shall mention and notice a few of them.

"The first falsehood I shall bring to your notice is on the first page;—there it is asserted that O. Scott 'was not permitted to speak but *once* on the question, and of course could not reply' to the arguments of those who had answered him. Now, sir, would a distant reader of this pamphlet suppose that the right of speaking *twice* on this question was secured by the rules and orders of the General Conference to O. Scott? or that O. Scott had been encouraged by a large majority of the conference, to claim the most liberal enjoyment of his right on the occasion? Yet, sir, this General Conference, to whom this pamphlet is addressed, knows



that he had this right, and that there was no restraint upon its exercise; the purpose of this falsehood is too obvious to be a matter of question for a moment; the writer wished to have it understood by those at a distance, (those on the spot know the contrary,) that a fair opportunity was denied the abettors of abolitionism to defend their cause, and that they were condemned without the privilege of being heard. [Br. Winans *knew*, and so did the whole conference, that the *tenth rule* by which we were governed positively prohibited 'any person speaking more than *once*, until every member choosing to speak shall have spoken.' He knew that had we spent a week on the subject, there was no reason to *believe* the anti-abolitionists would have finished so that O. Scott could have spoken a second time. The whole General Conference knew, that when I rose to speak to an amendment after I had finished my first speech, I was called to order by a member for speaking twice, as he supposed, to the same question, when I only rose to speak to an amendment, and occupied but three minutes; and I was then pronounced in order, on the ground that *before* I had spoken to the main question; *now* I was speaking to an amendment. But had I attempted to speak to the main question *twice*, it is worse than idle to deny that I should have been immediately stopped: indeed I should have been stopped by the *rule*; for it is well known that all did not speak who wished to. And yet for stating a fact, I am accused of telling a 'palpable falsehood!' and so published to the world! I leave it with an intelligent community to judge who told the falsehood in this case. Br. Winans says, 'that the right of speaking twice on that question, was secured to me by the rules and orders of the General Conference!' What a statement! No notice, however, was taken of it. It was by *such* statements that I was proved guilty of *falsehood*, while *such* accusers escaped uncensured. This was Methodist justice in 1836! The conference did suspend the fifteen minute rule in my case, after they had done it on the same question in several instances for my opponents; so that I was allowed to speak *once* to the question, and to say all I wished at that time. But this was no extraordinary 'liberality,' as Br. Winans intimates, as it was understood in the commencement that I would do the principal part of the speaking in behalf of the abolitionists, and as each of my opponents had the *same liberty*.]

"The second falsehood I shall notice, is on page 10. It is in these words:—'Rev. W. Winans stated that slavery was a divine institution, and must of course be right. God, said he, has instituted PERPETUAL HEREDITARY SLAVERY, and therefore it is right under all circumstances.' Now, sir, there is not one word of truth in this statement, as you know, and as this conference knows. I say more—I say that there was nothing in what I said on that occasion, which any man capable of rational perception could have understood in the sense of this statement. [*Not one word of truth in this statement!*] Observe what he says, a little further on, in giving an account of his own speech, and then judge whether 'there is not one word of truth in the above statement!' See if the *very words* are not used in both places,

and in the *same sense*. Then pass on to where he quotes an account of his speech from the 'Philanthropist,' and from which he does not dissent in a single particular, and see if he does not acknowledge, in these two places, in substance, *all* I attribute to him. And yet he proclaims that there is 'not one word of truth in my statement!' Is not *this* an 'outrageous indignity?' But this brother was permitted to charge me just as he pleased, and then support his charges by such unfounded assertions! That there was an error in my statement of one of his arguments, I have never denied. But it will be readily seen that Br. Winans has here stated what is not true, in his great zeal to convict me of falsehood. Out of his own mouth he is condemned.] O. Scott had laid down as his positions, that slavery was morally right in *some* circumstances, in *no* circumstances or in *all* circumstances, and had contended that if it was right in some circumstances, it was therefore right in all circumstances. [I never contended any such thing. I contended that 'slavery was wrong under all circumstances;' and not as he says, 'if it was right in some circumstances it was therefore right in all circumstances.' This statement of his is entirely without foundation, as I asserted in my defence on the floor of the General Conference; and he has never denied the truth of my assertion.] From these positions and this conclusion of O. Scott, I undertook to prove that slavery was right in all circumstances; thus—God could not *permit, regulate, and leave uncensured*, that which, in the circumstances in which he permitted and regulated it, was morally wrong; but in certain circumstances, *God has permitted, regulated and left uncensured. PERPETUAL HEREDITARY SLAVERY*, therefore if according to O. Scott's conclusion, what is morally right in some circumstances, must be morally right in all circumstances, [this was no. O. Scott's conclusion, as has been shown] slavery must be morally right in all circumstances. Now whether this argument be or be not conclusive, is not the present question,—it is not what the pamphlet ascribes to me, it is not like what it ascribes to me. [Let the reader judge whether it is not '*like*' what the pamphlet ascribes to him.] The flagrant character of this falsehood will appear the more glaring when it is recollected by you, as it must be, that I distinctly declined any discussion of the abstract question of slavery, in regard to its moral aspect, intimating, however, that if called upon to decide upon its character as an original institution and apart from the circumstances in which it exists, I should pass a very different judgment from that which, as I conceive, circumstances rendered proper in regard to slavery as now existing in the South. You will bear me witness, and so will this General Conference,—even the 'Philanthropist' bears me witness,—that the above is a just statement of my arguments on this point. [The 'Philanthropist' *proves*, as the reader will see, that Br. Winans did not decline all 'discussion of the abstract question.' Br. W. says, in the language of the 'Philanthropist,' which he adopts as his own, that 'he would meet the brother on the *fundamental ground* of his argument.—would examine his *strong moral views* of slavery.' Now what was the '*fundamental*

ground' of my argument? Was it not that slavery is, under all circumstances, *sin*; that it is *essential sin*; a *sin in itself*, and apart from circumstances; that it is always and every where sin; that the principle itself is a reprobat, too bad to be converted? Were not these my 'strong moral views?' On this ground he *promised* to 'meet' me, and these views he promised to 'examine.' Did I attempt to show that 'circumstances' made American slavery wrong, or that it was wrong aside from all circumstances? Every person who heard me knows it was the latter. And it was here that Br. W. proposed to meet me—but *how* did he meet me?]

"That paper says of Mr. Winans, 'he would meet the brother on the fundamental ground of his argument,—would examine his strong moral views of slavery; it had been assumed that slavery was wrong in 'some circumstances, in no circumstances, or in all circumstances.' Now he designed to prove from the brother's own admission, slavery was right in all circumstances. Jehovah had permitted, had regulated slavery. Would he permit, would he regulate that which was morally wrong? Could there be a blinding influence strong enough to induce any one to charge God with sanctioning crime? It would be needless to refer to particular scriptures, but many passages did exist which established beyond controversy, that God did permit perpetual hereditary slavery. [Is not this making 'slavery a divine institution?'] This admitted, it was plain that circumstances might deprive slavery of an immoral character. He would have opposed slavery in its origin. It was as clear as the morning sun that slavery in the *abstract* is wrong, [he says he 'declined any discussion of the *abstract* question!'] Can you believe this? But look at this admission. 'It was as clear as the morning sun that slavery in the *abstract* is wrong.' And yet he became a slave holder from '*principle*.' And *deacons*, *elders*, and *BISHOPS*, ought to be *slave holders* in this *Christian land*! but is it wrong in the Southern states? This is the point in dispute between abolitionists and anti-abolitionists. Have we not seen that circumstances justified it in the case of the Hebrews; [is not this saying that Jewish slavery was *right*?] If circumstances can justify it, he thought they existed in the South.' [Is not this saying that American slavery is *right*?] Do not these assertions come pretty near saying, in substance, that 'slavery is right under all circumstances?' Could any thing but downright madness find in this argument the sense of the above statement taken from the pamphlet? [The reader will judge.] I am not now concerned to justify my argument. All that is incumbent on me is to show that 'the member of this body,' in the statement which he has made of my speech, has uttered a falsehood, for which there is not the slightest show or foundation in my argument. [Nothing but assertion.]

"I shall notice but one more falsehood found in this pamphlet,—I mean but one more direct, barefaced falsehood. That is found on the 13th and 14th pages. It is as follows: 'Our southern brethren told us it would not do to let the South know that we were as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery.' No

southern brother told us any such thing. [Mark that.] On the contrary, many southern brethren told us that our discipline contained that declaration already, and that it was therefore wholly unnecessary to publish it in another form: they did contend that to associate the declaration so needlessly with the condemnation of abolitionism, which they were about to publish, would tend to create suspicion in the South that that condemnation was not hearty; and that, owing to the excited state of southern feeling, in consequence of abolition agitation, such a gratuitous publication of an old declaration of our church in a new and questionable form, would be pernicious in its tendency. [Here he acknowledges all I had attributed to him, and which, but a few lines before, he promptly denies! This is the way I was proved guilty of 'palpable falsehood' at the last General Conference!!]

"I will now, sir, place under your consideration a few passages from the pamphlet in question, which, if not directly false, have, nevertheless, all the essential characters of falsehood. O. Scott had represented the South as blinded by interest against the light of abolition illumination, under the trite figure,—'it is difficult to see through a silver dollar.' I alluded to this happy illustration when urging that the only influence that abolitionists could exert upon the question of slavery in the South, was a moral influence, and observed that whatever difficulty we might have in the South of seeing through a silver dollar motives to emancipate our slaves, the difficulty of seeing through the rage of incendiary fires, through scenes of carnage, murdered wives and children, &c., which the South considered the direct *consequences of abolitionism* would be absolutely insuperable. Now, I ask, if this bears a very strong resemblance to what the pamphlet makes me say on this subject, on page 14. [I ask, if this was not precisely the view I took of this passage of his speech, in my review of his arguments? And yet it is said my statement has all the essential characters of falsehood! Who could have thought a Methodist General Conference would have sat still and heard one of its members thus *groundlessly accused* by another, and then cap the climax of inconsistency, by passing a resolution accusing a brother of 'palpable falsehoods,' without the regular forms of trial? Alas for poor human nature, when prompted by slavery and prejudice to cruel deeds! How little the golden rule had to do with these strange proceedings! The Lord pity and forgive the brethren who have thus severely and cruelly handled the character of a sincere and well-meaning brother. In comparison of such treatment, it were a small thing to be *wished dead*!]

"Who, in this General Conference, has any recollection of the strong sayings on the subject of dividing the Union, ascribed to O. Scott, on page 6, as follows: 'But if the North do not give up this discussion, the Union will be dissolved?' 'who will divide it? The North will not do this; and what have the South to gain by it? If the South divide the Union, they lose, at that moment, all northern support, in case of insurrection; and their safety now consists in their union with the North. Let the South divide the Union, and make a war upon

the North; they must support it either with white or colored soldiers. If they march their white men against the North, who will take care of their women and children, left in the hands of the slaves at home; &c. I recollect nothing like it, and yet I never listened to any speaker more attentively, or with more intense desire to understand his every word. Is not this whole passage an act of thought; but, sir, it is not my intention, it is not necessary, to pursue this disgusting inquiry further. I will therefore only say, in reference to the falsehood charged in the resolution upon the pamphlet in question, that, so far as I recollect, it is, if not *unricalled, at least unsurpassed by any thing I have ever met with in the annals of this detestable vice.* [Be it remembered, that this is the treatment which one Methodist preacher received from another in the presence of 150 ministers, and a large number of spectators, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on the 24th day of May, 1836. And, in the room of any rebuke for this informal and unbrotherly attack upon the character of a member of the General Conference, that body, the next day, sanctioned the whole proceeding, by passing the resolution, without dissenting from any particular contained in it, or from any item in Mr. Winans' inflammatory and censorious speech. So, without the forms of trial, the General Conference publishes a brother throughout the United States, as guilty of 'palpable falsehoods!' Fine example this, to be followed by our ministers and members! Will it be said, 'that no brother was accused; that it was the pamphlet that had told the lies?' Such pretensions are too ridiculous to merit any serious reply. Such proceedings, it is believed, are unparalleled in the history of *civilized nations*, not to say *religious assemblies*! These are some of the effects of slavery. On any other subject, no such notice would have been taken of these alleged incorrect statements. But the election of bishops had just taken place; the South failed, were disappointed, and on the point of rebellion. A sacrifice was required, and the occasion soon presented one. A brother had dealt out *hard arguments* against slavery, and as the slave holders could not answer his arguments, nor get him out of the world by wishes, they must take measures to *maim him*, and thus destroy his influence, and the influence of his pamphlet. A majority of the brethren were prepared to say, 'ask what you will [except a slave holding bishop] and it shall be done unto you.' The reply was, 'give us the character of O. Scott 'in a charge,' alias *charges*. Agreed. Prepare your resolution to suit yourselves, and it shall be sustained! Such appears to have been the feeling, though perhaps not expressed in words. There were, it is true, some honorable exceptions to this determination to sacrifice a brother because he was an abolitionist, and not perfect; and among these were Rev. Messrs. D. Ostrander, P. P. Sandford, Martin Ruter, Elias Bowen, and others, who made exertions to get the resolution modified; but, failing in this, the two former, I believe, voted for it as it was. Now look at the mildness and Christian simplicity contained in the last paragraph of this extraordinary speech.]

"Nothing, I suppose, need be urged to show that such a pamphlet addressed to this General

Conference is an *outrageous indignity*, calling for solemn, unqualified and vigorous reprehension. It is enough to say, that, with *reckless effrontery*, the writer of this pamphlet has addressed to this conference statements which *he could not but know were known to be false by every individual present in the conference*, and that these false statements are calculated, according to the views of the writer at least, to injure the characters of some of the members of the conference, and, indeed, to reflect upon the Conference itself."

#### GREAT EXCITEMENT

You may well imagine, dear brethren, that the above resolution and speech produced, upon an already sensitive General Conference, no little excitement. Many, if not most of the members, were on their feet before Br. W. had finished reading. There was a spirit of indignation ready, in all parts of the house, to burst forth upon the nameless author of the offensive production. In the midst of the storm, while the thunders were yet rolling and the lightnings flashing—and while it was literally growing dark—I arose, and avowed myself the author of the pamphlet; and requested, as it was then late, that the resolution might be laid on the table till the next morning, that I might have an opportunity to defend myself. This request was granted. I requested a copy of the resolution, which was also granted. After the Conference adjourned, I went to Brother Winans, and requested the loan of his manuscript till the next morning, that I might be prepared to reply; but this he peremptorily refused, assigning as a reason, that *he could not trust me with it!* I had, however, taken some notes while the brother was reading his speech. Rev. J. A. Merrill, of the New England, and Rev. C. Baker, of the Maine Conference, had done the same. And as they kindly "trusted" me with their notes, by comparing them with my own I was enabled to reply to the principal things charged against me in Brother Winans' speech.

Morning came, and with it a disposition among some of my opponents, to let the whole subject remain on the table. The galleries were filled with spectators anxious to hear my defence;—but they must not be gratified. All attempts to call up the resolution were unsuccessful, till the spectators had principally retired.

## O. SCOTT'S DEFENCE.

The following outline of my Defence is from the "Philanthropist." The editor took very brief notes, with the expectation that I would be able to assist him in preparing them for the press, but which, in consequence of numerous engagements, I could not do,—except, I believe, in one point.

"The resolution of the last evening against Mr. Scott excited considerable interest. At the usual hour for the opening of the Conference, many of the citizens had assembled, and the galleries were well filled, expecting that the resolution against Mr. Scott would, of course, be the first business attended to, after the ceremony of opening the meeting had been performed. However, this did not turn out to be the case. Some other matter was taken up. After this had been discussed some time, and to all appearance, was about occupying the whole forenoon, Mr. Scott moved that the business then before the House, be postponed, in order to take up the resolution against himself. The motion failed. A short time afterward Mr. Early renewed the motion made by Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott earnestly appealed to his brethren to sustain the motion, remarking that, although Mr. Ostrander, (a gentleman who had manifested a disposition to exclude all further consideration of the resolution) seemed determined that the resolution should not be taken up at all, yet he (Mr. Scott) thought it due to his character, that it should be called up immediately. He felt that it had already been postponed too long. He was keenly sensible of the injury under which he was suffering, and every moment of unnecessary delay, only added to its aggravation. Mr. Early's motion was lost. It was now about 11 o'clock in the morning—the regular time for adjournment being half past 12. A motion was then made by a member, and carried—that, when the Conference adjourn, it adjourn to meet again at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. A large majority of the spectators, supposing from the course things had taken, that the resolution would not be taken up till the afternoon, retired from the House. However, not long after the galleries were thinned, and before the business under consideration was entirely disposed of, Mr. Early having renewed his motion, the resolution was called up. This was one hour, as stated by Mr. Early, before the usual period for adjournment.

"The resolution being read, Mr. Scott commenced by saying, that this day, one of the strangest spectacles was presented, which had ever been witnessed in the history of the church. A member of the highest assembly recognized in the church, was now arraigned before it, charged with glaring, palpable falsehood, and this not once, but many times over. Under such circumstances, it could not be expected that he should appear without emotion, yet he trusted he experienced a good degree of calmness. It was the first time in his life he had been charged with falsehood. Those who knew him best, had always been willing to accord to him purity of motive. In the resolu-

tion, he was accused of uttering a deliberate falsehood, of stating as true, what he knew to be false. This was a serious, a grave charge, and enough, if sustained, to disfranchise him of both his ministerial character and his membership. He had not only been accused of 'barefaced, glaring and palpable' falsehood—Br. Winans had also declared, that the author of that pamphlet must either be a 'reckless incendiary or a *non compos mentis*.' If he (Mr. Scott) had set fire to the city of Cincinnati, he could hardly have been treated with more severity. What is the usual course, in cases of mistakes? Suppose in replying to any member, he should mis-state any of his arguments—would it be right—would it be in order, for that brother to rise in his place and charge him with falsehood? Was there then so much difference between a speech written and a speech delivered, as in the one case, where there are mistakes, to warrant the charge of 'barefaced, glaring and palpable falsehood,' and in the other, to call only for correction?

## DESIGN OF THE PAMPHLET.

"He wished to direct the attention of brethren to the design of the pamphlet. It would be recollected, that the arguments, adduced by him on the subject of abolitionism, had been replied to, only in part, and superficially. Brs. Winans, Crowder, and others in the opposition, moreover, had not been answered by brethren on his side of the question. This suggested to his mind the idea of writing a little address, in which he could present to the view of brethren, his argument entire, and the objections and arguments of opponents, together with replies to them, prepared subsequently by himself, but not delivered on the Conference floor; and present them all *in connexion*.

## FIRST FALSEHOOD.

"Brother Winans had accused the author of the Address of falsehood, because of his statement on the first page, that O. Scott 'was permitted to speak but once on the question.' I meant by this, said Mr. Scott, what must be obvious to all, that according to one of the rules of order, adopted by this body, I was thus restricted. The rule is, that no member shall speak twice on the same question, until all others who may wish to speak have spoken. Now I need not tell this conference, that had the subject been debated ten days longer, I should by this rule, have been effectually prohibited from speaking a second time. For we all know, that speakers were abundant, and when the question was taken, all had not spoken, who desired to be heard. It was in view of these facts, I stated, that I was permitted to speak but once; and not with any view to convey an impression that I had been denied this privilege by an unusual order of the Conference. Brethren know there is such a rule, and they know too how unlikely it was, that it should be set aside in my behalf. They are all aware, that, on the last day of the discussion, I was called to order by a member for speaking twice, as he supposed to the same question, when I only rose to speak to an amendment, and occupied but three minutes;—and I was then pronounced in order, on the ground that *before*, I had spoken to the main question; *now*, I was speaking to an amendment. I might, indeed,

have made my meaning less liable to be mistaken, by stating 'according to the rules of the house I had not such permission;' but as this was my sole meaning, so it never entered my mind for one moment, that I should be misunderstood. Ought this omission then to subject a brother to the high and heavy charge of falsehood? Never did such an idea enter my mind, as an intention to deceive by this omission.

#### SECOND FALSEHOOD.

"Mr. Scott said that he had been charged with falsehood, in making such a statement of brother Winans' argument, as is found on page 10 of the pamphlet.

"This is the strongest, and indeed, the principal position which brother W. has taken against me. I will make a few statements, and then the Conference will be able to judge whether I have indeed, in this instance, subjected myself to the charge of palpable, barefaced, glaring, wilful falsehood! I intended to state brother Winans' argument as briefly as possible, and yet not so briefly as to give either a partial or false view of the sentiment of the speaker. I thought the inference that 'slavery is right under all circumstances' a fair one from his premises—Nay more, I understood him to draw that inference in whole, or in part, from *his own premises*. His argument when stated a little more at length, was simply this;—I will attempt to show from the brother's (Mr. Scott) own premises, that slavery is right under all circumstances. He then stated, that slavery was a divine institution—God permitted the Hebrews to hold slaves, and made laws to regulate slavery. It must therefore be right under some circumstances—and the brother from New England has told us, that if slavery is right under *some* circumstances, it is right under *all* circumstances. I have proved that it is right under some circumstances, and therefore from the brother's own admission, it is right under *all* circumstances.' But it may be observed in the *first* place, that I never admitted, that *if* slavery was right under *some* circumstances, it was right under *all*—I never made such a statement. In the second place, I never denied that the Scriptures allowed the Jews to hold servants. I am not such a *non compos mentis* as not to know this fact. It will be seen therefore that brother W. in making out his conclusion, that *slavery is right under all circumstances*, attributes to me, what I never said, and assumes, what I never denied—so that my premises have no sort of connexion with his inference—and for it he alone is responsible. I did not suppose, I was doing him any injustice in stating his argument as I did—I certainly had no such *design*, and therefore will submit this explanation as an accompaniment to my original statement of his argument. And whether the inference, that slavery is right under all circumstances, belongs more properly to him or to me, to his premises or to mine, I leave for the Conference and the public to judge. Suppose I were to affirm that polygamy is right under *some* circumstances [Here Mr. Winans interrupted the speaker, and remarked that he really believed him to be out of order. He demanded that he should be kept to the record—that he should speak directly to the charge made against him—and not be per-

mitted to wander into irrelevant discussion. The Bishop decided Mr. Scott was in order. Mr. Winans still persisted, and others of the South, sided with him.] The Bishop (Roberts) decided, that so long as Mr. Scott was respectful in his manner, he might take any course he saw proper to defend himself, but brethren might appeal. [An appeal was called for, and the motion being put, a majority voted to sustain the decision of the chair.] Mr. Scott said he did not intend to be disrespectful. He was endeavoring to explain to the Conference, how he had been led to mistake the argument of brother Winans, if he indeed had mistaken it. He was proceeding to suppose a case. Suppose I were to affirm that polygamy is right under *some* circumstances, or *no* circumstances, or *all* circumstances—I soon come to the conclusion, that it is wrong under all circumstances. But no, says brother Winans, I can prove from your own premises that polygamy is right under all circumstances. It was allowed, it is recognized, and not condemned in Jewish scriptures among the Jews, and therefore it is right, according to your premises, under *all* circumstances! Who does not readily see the sophistry of such an argument!

"Br. Winans *did* state that slavery was a divine institution—perpetual, hereditary slavery; and yet he affirmed of the representation of his argument in which this statement is made, that 'every word of it was false.' If it be false, it is unintentionally so. I took down notes of his argument at the time, and the representation accords exactly with them. I never used the premises he represented as mine. I am not surprised, sir, that brethren should be much excited when they see their arguments in print, and think them misrepresented.

"Br. Winans stated that he declined the abstract question of slavery. Now his speech as reported in the Philanthropist, which he yesterday quoted, as confirmatory of the truth of his charge against me, makes him say, that he would meet me on the abstract question, on my own ground. I did not understand him as declining the abstract question.

#### THIRD FALSEHOOD.

"I am accused of another falsehood, because on page 13 of the pamphlet, I represent our southern brethren as saying, that 'it would not do to let the south know that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery. If brethren of the South did not say this—did not say that the proposed amendment, in the language of our discipline, would be believed a mere cloak for secret abolitionism—if they did not say, it would not do *now*—then did I hear very erroneously. [Mr. Scott did not hear erroneously. It was repeatedly asserted on the floor of the Conference, that it would not 'do to speak out now'—that 'there was a time for every thing,' &c. &c. Hundreds of spectators must have heard the same things.—ED. PHIL.]

#### DIVISION OF THE UNION.

"Br. Winans stated, that he did not remember the remarks concerning the division of the Union, attributed to me on page 6, of the pamphlet. I did allude to this objection to the doctrines of abolition, and made also some remarks upon it. But they are carried out more fully

in the pamphlet. It would have been better to have included the added remarks in brackets. But this was neglected, not however with the intention to deceive. [It is easy to explain this omission. Mr. Scott wrote the pamphlet, superintended its printing, correcting proof, &c., under circumstances very unfavorable to entire exactness and perspicuity. The pamphlet was written and ready for circulation within one week, during all of which period he had numerous Conference engagements to attend to. Under such circumstances, it is not wonderful that in reporting his own speech, he should at times forget his character as a reporter, and carry out his thoughts as if they were constituent parts of the delivered speech. It is indeed a matter of surprise that many other such mistakes did not occur.—ED. PHIL.]

#### MISREPRESENTATION.

"I am again accused of misrepresentation, in attributing to Br. Winans the remarks made on page 10, about 'murdered wives and children,' &c. My sole intention was to show, that the brother meant, such would be the effects of abolitionism, if its measures were carried out. This, I presume, he will not deny *was* his meaning.—[Mr. Winans did not deny it either then or subsequently.—ED.] Mr. Scott made some further remarks on this charge, of which our notes are insufficient to warrant any report. In our opinion he fully acquitted himself of the charge of falsehood or intentional misrepresentation.

"Mr. Scott occupied about an hour and a quarter in his remarks. He manifested the same calmness, self-possession and dignity—the same Christian forbearance and meekness of temper—which had characterized all his previous exhibitions in the Conference. Nothing offensive in his manner, spirit or language, could at any time be detected. In not a single instance, was he called to order by the chair or any member of the Conference; except indeed, the instance already noticed. All this was wonderful—especially to a beholder—considering the greatness of his provocations, the scandalous nature of the charges preferred against him, and the unfaltering pertinacity, the unmitigated severity, which marked the language and measures of his opponents."

After a few remarks by two or three brethren, the Conference adjourned to meet again at three o'clock, having lengthened the session fifteen minutes for me to get through.

Immediately after the opening of the Conference in the afternoon, Rev. D. Ostrander, after making some remarks, moved to refer the resolution to a select committee. This motion was supported by Rev. P. P. Sandford, and I believe some others; but so decided was the opposition to it, that the mover withdrew it. It was immediately renewed by Rev. M. Ruter. Br. Bowen spoke against the original resolution, and read a substitute. The motion to refer to a select committee was laid on the table.

#### O. SCOTT NOT TO BE CENSURED—NO COURAGE IN THE CONFERENCE.

The Conference were then urged to pass the original resolution, by attempts to make it appear, that it was not understood to impeach the MOTIVES of the author; and that to refuse to pass it, would show a lack of COURAGE!

"Rev. Mr. Drake said, in answer to the objections taken by some to the resolutions, as impeaching the motives of the author—he declared he did not so interpret them, nor did he suppose they would be so interpreted by others. He did not consider the resolutions as impeaching the *motives* of the writer—his object was, the *pamphlet*. The *pamphlet* it was that would serve to increase the number of abolitionists—it was the influence of it, and not the character of the author, that the mover of the resolution, doubtless, had in view in introducing it in the Conference.

"With this view, Rev. Mr. Crowder made some remarks intended to show that there was in the resolution no impeachment of the *motives* of the author—that there was nothing levelled against him *personally*—that it was the *pamphlet*, and this alone, which was now under consideration, and which it was intended to condemn.

Rev. Messrs. W. Capers and J. Early appealed to the *chivalry* of the Conference. They represented that the Conference lacked *energy*—that if they did not act at once, the impression would go abroad, that they were wanting in *courage*. The latter said, among other things:

"Sir, we have no *energy*. But if a majority of this Conference have no energy—not enough of it, to protect their own honor from insult and degradation—be it known, that there are in the Conference those who *have*—AND WHO OUGHT TO BE BY THEMSELVES. It is full time, for you, sir, to speak *out*—to testify that you have some respect for yourselves—to say that you have some regard for your *honor*. Submit to this, sir! If we submit to this, we are prepared to submit to any thing."

Thus by separating the sin from the sinner on the one hand, by representing that O. Scott was not to be harmed, his motives were not to be impeached, it was only the pamphlet that was to be condemned—and on the other hand, by representing an unwillingness to pass the resolution as *cowardly*, as not maintaining the honor and dignity of the Conference—and by an indirect threat to divide the Church, if the Conference faltered on this subject;—all these things taken into the account, in connection with the excited state of feeling

on the subject of abolition, is it strange that two thirds of the Conference were prevailed upon to pass the resolution? Or is the passage of *such* a resolution under *such* circumstances, certain evidence that the pamphlet is *false*? Was not this an easy way to answer arguments which they could not dispose of by sound reasoning? The object to be accomplished was the *destruction of the pamphlet*, not the author; of course.

Reference to the passage of this resolution, will be found in one or two other places in this examination.

### REPLY TO REV. N. BANGS.

I come now to a more particular examination of the "Review of the Proceedings of the late General Conference."

The Review correctly states the substance of my main position in relation to the sin of slavery, viz., that "Slavery is wrong in *some* circumstances, in *no* circumstances, or in *all* circumstances: he then took the ground that it is wrong under *all* circumstances." But the reviewer thinks there is a contradiction between the position that slavery is wrong under all circumstances, and my admission that "God himself expressly permitted his people to enslave the Canaanites." But how did I admit this? By quoting a passage from the report of the Synod of Kentucky containing that expression. I never admitted, in my own language, any more than that God permitted the Jews to hold *servants*. But if the reviewer will have it that this expression is mine, because I quoted it without dissenting from the sentiment, very well; only let him not refuse, hereafter, *his own coin*. So far, then, as the present argument is concerned, I will admit that "God himself expressly permitted his people to *enslave* the Canaanites." Does this admission conflict in any way with my doctrine, that slavery is wrong under *all* circumstances? If so, *how*? The reviewer pretends that if slavery was permitted among the Jews, and if, as I contended, no circumstances can change its moral character, it must, of course, be right *now*! My words were, "Circumstances might palliate, and circumstances might aggravate; but no circumstances could justify the *principle*." But, for the sake of the argu-

ment, I will take the expression which the reviewer attributes to me, viz., that the moral character of slavery does not depend upon circumstances. I should not have supposed the Rev. N. Bangs would have hazarded his reputation as a logician upon such a pretence. How could he help seeing such a conclusion would prove too much. Br. Winans' inference is endorsed by the reviewer in the following manner. He says "that the major proposition was mine; that it (slavery) did not depend upon circumstances for its moral character; that it was permitted under the Old Testament; and hence Mr. Winans inferred, *most logically, we think*, that it must be right under all circumstances!" Admit, for the moment, all that is attributed to me in the above extract. What then? Does the inference follow from the premises? Is it not true that many other things are wrong under all circumstances, which God himself expressly permitted? Does not this triumphant conclusion prove too much?

### ILLUSTRATIONS.

Suppose I were to say that offensive wars *are* wrong under all circumstances, and yet were to admit that the Jews were permitted to commence and carry on exterminating wars among the nations around them.

Suppose I were to assert that the moral character of polygamy does not depend upon circumstances; that it is wrong, under all circumstances; and yet admit that it was expressly allowed among the Jews.

Suppose I were to affirm that it is wrong, under all circumstances, to take the life of a child for disobedience to parents; that the moral character of putting a child to death for such an offence does not depend upon circumstances, and yet admit that the Jews were commanded to do this.

Again, I declare that it is wrong, under all circumstances, for one to take the life of a person without the forms of trial, who kills his near friend; that the moral character of such an act does not depend upon circumstances; and yet admit that the Jews were permitted to do this.

Once more,—I take the ground that it is wrong, under all circumstances, to

put a man to death for breaking the Sabbath; and yet admit that the Jews were expressly directed to put a man to death for gathering a few sticks on the Sabbath.

I also assert that *profanity, idolatry and enticing* to idolatry, though wrong, ought not to be punished with death; that to punish them with death is wrong, under all circumstances; and yet admit that the Jews were expressly permitted to punish with death all these crimes; and that, too, in view of that precept of the moral law,—“Thou shalt not kill.”

Now, I ask, how it would appear, to see Rev. N. Bangs attempt to show that there is any contradiction in any of the above statements, or that, because the Jews were permitted to take life in the above-mentioned instances, that therefore it is right *now*? I ask, how would such reasoning appear to the logician? This is precisely the ground Br. B. has taken. For he says Mr. Winans argued “*most logically!*” But because I took the ground that slavery is wrong under all circumstances, notwithstanding it was permitted among the Jews, I am incapable of “understanding a logical argument.”

Will it be said, that, though these things were right *once*, yet they are wrong *now*. But this would be to yield the argument. *Slavery* (if I must be kept to that term in speaking of Jewish servitude,) though right three thousand years ago, as a punishment for sin, is wrong now under all circumstances. But what makes it wrong now? The same that makes it wrong now to take the life of a person for disobedience to parents, for profanity, for picking up sticks on the Sabbath, for idolatry, and enticing to idolatry, &c. But it may be said we are not under the Mosaic dispensation. Very well; then why bring Jewish servitude to justify American slavery? Or why bring an admission that Jewish slavery was permitted by God, to prove a contradiction between the assertion that the moral character of slavery does not depend upon circumstances, and that it is wrong under all circumstances. I can say of all the things which I have specified, (and of many more which can be specified when my opponent has disposed of these,) that their moral character does not de-

pend upon circumstances; that they are wrong under all circumstances; and yet that they were allowed among the Jews. But where is the contradiction?

#### WHY WAS JEWISH SERVITUDE ALLOWED?

But what reason was given for the admission that slavery was allowed among the Jews? Why did not the reviewer give my whole argument on that point? It was only one short paragraph. Ah! had he done this, he could not have had quite so much sport in making and then demolishing his man of straw. The following is the paragraph alluded to, and it contains all I said about Jewish slavery.

“It is often pleaded, that in the Old Testament God himself expressly permitted his people to enslave the Canaanites. True, for God may punish any of the children of sin as he sees fit; He has a right to do so, and *He alone has a right*. He may commission either the winds, or the waves, or the pestilence, or their fellow-men, to work his purpose of vengeance upon any people. But *man has no right to arrogate the prerogative of the Almighty—he has no right, uncommissioned by his Maker, either to enslave or destroy his fellow*. God commissioned Saul to exterminate the Amalekites; could we plead this as an excuse for the massacre of an Indian tribe? God expressly directed his prophet Samuel to hew Agag in pieces; could any of us allege this as a ground for cutting down every man whom he considered as an enemy of Zion’s King? How, then, can any man assert, that because God determined to punish the Canaanites, and used the Israelites as the executioners of his decree, we are at liberty to obey the dictates of our own avarice, and hold our fellow-men in bondage? Is not such a perversion of God’s holy word more shocking than Belshazzar’s desecration of the sacred vessels of the sanctuary, when he and his concubines drank wine out of them, amid the drunken revelry of his impious feast?”

It will be seen from this extract, that I put the right of the Jews to enslave the Canaanites upon the express permission of God, as a punishment for sin. And so far as the success of my argument is concerned, I am willing still to abide by this position, though Jewish servitude was very different from American slavery.

#### SUBJECT IN DISPUTE.

But what was the subject in dispute? It was not Jewish slavery—it was not Greek and Roman slavery—nor any other but American slavery. It was of this, and this alone, that I predicated, that its moral character did not depend upon circumstances, and that it was



wrong under all circumstances. Brother Winans bears witness to the truth of this remark in the speech which he read to the General Conference, and which has since been printed; a copy of which is now lying before me. His words are, "but is slavery wrong in the *United States*? *This is the point in dispute between the abolitionists and anti-abolitionists.*" Every member of the General Conference *knew* that it was American slavery, and nothing else, that the abolitionists opposed. Where then is the fairness of the course taken by the reviewer?

#### WHO DEFENDED SLAVERY FROM THE BIBLE?

He states again, that Mr. Winans "availed himself of my admission, that God himself did permit his people to enslave the Canaanites." This statement is entirely without foundation. He never availed himself of any such thing. And he shall be his own witness here. All that he ever pretended to avail himself of, as it related to my premises, was what he called my "conclusion;" viz. that "what is morally right in some circumstances, must be morally right in all circumstances," but which I will show, in another place, was not my conclusion. All I said about Jewish slavery is contained in the above extract. What he said on that point, he did not pretend to attribute to me, and I presume he would not be willing to divide its authorship with another.

• In his written speech, which he appended to the resolution condemning the pamphlet, in which he undertakes to show what he did say in his first speech, he says, "O. Scott had laid down his positions, that slavery was morally wrong, in *some* circumstances, in *no* circumstances, or in *all* circumstances. From these positions and this conclusion of O. Scott, I undertook to prove that slavery was right under all circumstances; thus, God could not *permit, regulate, and leave uncensured* that which in the circumstances in which he permitted and regulated, was morally wrong; but in certain circumstances God has permitted, regulated, and left uncensured, **PERPETUAL, HEREDITARY SLAVERY.** [When did I ever use such language, or express such sentiments?

NEVER. Neither did Br. W. ever pretend to attribute this to me. This was *his own* position.] Therefore if, according to O. Scott's conclusion, what is morally right in some circumstances, must be morally right in all circumstances, *slavery must be morally right in all circumstances!*" That Mr. Winans was not mistaken in what he did say upon this point, is evident from the report of his speech in the "Philanthropist." The extract from this paper, which Mr. W. incorporated into his written and printed speech, here follows.

"He would meet the brother on the fundamental ground of his argument—would examine his strong moral views of slavery. It had been assumed, that slavery was wrong in *some* circumstances, in *no* circumstances or in *all* circumstances. Now he designed to prove, from the brother's own admission, that slavery was right in *all* circumstances. Jehovah had permitted—had regulated slavery; would he permit—would he regulate that which was morally wrong? Could there be a blinding influence, strong enough to induce any one to charge God with sanctioning crime? It would be needless to refer to particular scriptures; but many passages did exist which established beyond controversy that God did permit *perpetual, hereditary* slavery. This admitted, it was plain, that circumstances might deprive slavery of an immoral character. He would have opposed slavery in its *origin*. It was as clear as the morning sun, that slavery in the abstract is wrong. But is it wrong now in the Southern States? This is the point in dispute between abolitionists and *anti-abolitionists*. Have we not seen, that circumstances justified it in the case of the Hebrews? If circumstances *can* justify it, he thought they existed in the South."

Who can find, in either of the foregoing extracts, any thing like the statement, that Mr. W. availed himself of my admission, that "God himself did permit his people to enslave the Canaanites?" He took no notice of this admission—he went much further than I did, in his zeal to support perpetual hereditary slavery from the Bible. I never admitted that God ever permitted *such* slavery. Here one-third of the strength of the Review falls to the ground.

#### FALSE ASSUMPTION.

All the advantage which Br. W. pretended to take of my positions was, that "what is morally right in some circumstances, is morally right in all circumstances,"—*but this statement I never made.* In my defence on the floor of the General Conference, I expressly denied, as the reviewer well knew, having

ever uttered these words. And not a single brother charged me with this after my denial! But this false assumption was Br. W.'s whole strength, so far as my premises were concerned. Here another third of the strength of the Review falls to the ground!

#### REV. MR. WINANS—AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Again, Br. Bangs asks, "Did Mr. W. therefore say, that *American slavery* is right? No such thing." He did say just *such a thing*. His words were, "Have we not seen that *circumstances justified* it in the case of the Hebrews; if circumstances CAN justify it, he thought they existed in the South."

How, in view of this statement, my opponent could publish through the whole country, that Mr. W. never said that American slavery was right, I cannot conceive!

#### SLAVERY A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

But I come now to notice that which is said to have "created the greatest sensation, and the most profound astonishment."

"Rev. W. Winans stated that slavery was a divine institution—and must of course be right. God, said he, has instituted perpetual hereditary slavery—and therefore it is right under all circumstances. If circumstances ever did exist sufficient to justify slavery aside from revelation, then American slavery might be justified."

The reviewer comments as follows, on the above. "Mr. Scott says, 'Rev. W. Winans stated that slavery was a divine institution—and must, of course, be right.' *This was the falsehood.* Mr. Winans stated no such thing, but only that it so followed from Mr. Scott's own admission." Mark this broad denial! "Mr. W. stated *no such thing!*" Look at the extract from Mr. Winans' own written speech—look at the extract from the Philanthropist, which he endorses and incorporates into his speech—and then say, whether it is true that he said no such thing as that "slavery was a divine institution, and must of course be right." What! Is the assertion that "God has permitted, regulated, and left uncensured, perpetual hereditary slavery," nothing like saying "that slavery was a divine institution." Is it not saying that *very thing* in other words?

And is the saying, that circumstances justified Hebrew slavery—and that if circumstances ever justified it, they now existed in the South—saying nothing like it? Did he not say, in language as plain as words can speak, that American slavery, under existing circumstances, is right? And would the man, who "became a slave holder from *principle*, refuse to say it *now*? Would he not glory in the assertion? Have not the Georgia and South Carolina Conferences lately said what amounts to this, namely, that "slavery is not a moral evil?" Will Mr. Winans thank the reviewer for attempting to make it appear that he did not justify Hebrew and American slavery by circumstances and the Bible?

#### ADDITIONAL WITNESSES.

But if two witnesses, viz. Mr. Winans and the Philanthropist, both of which he united in his written speech, are not enough, I will add another. A statement of brother Winans' argument which was taken down *at the time*, and published soon after, by another member of the General Conference, is as follows: "Next spoke Wm. Winans.—Jehovah, he said, has permitted, has regulated slavery—and therefore right—if circumstances might exist that rendered slavery morally right, then the inquiry is, do those circumstances exist in the United States? He avowed that they did." Another member of the General Conference, whose unpublished notes I have seen, (and which can hereafter be given to the public,) fully substantiates every item of my statement of Br. Winans' argument, except the words "under all circumstances." Br. Winans never attempted to make out the falsehood on any other ground than my applying what he said of Hebrew and American slavery, to *slavery indiscriminately*. He never denied saying that Hebrew and American slavery were right. But the reviewer makes the falsehood to consist in something else. He charges me with falsehood in saying that Mr. Winans contended that Hebrew slavery was right—and that if circumstances ever justified slavery, they justified American slavery; whereas, every member of the General Conference must know that Mr. W. took and maintained that ground, without any reference to

my premises. My conclusion was, that slavery was wrong under all circumstances, though I admitted (in an extract) that God did permit the Jews to enslave the Canaanites, *as a punishment for their sins*. Br. Winans contended that it was "needless to refer to particular scriptures, but many passages did exist which established beyond controversy, that God did permit perpetual hereditary slavery; this admitted, it was plain, that circumstances might deprive slavery of an immoral character. *We* have seen that circumstances justified it in the case of the Hebrews; if circumstances can justify it, he thought they existed in the South. Thus far he went in his argument, without making use of any premises or conclusions of mine. He then availed himself of what he took to be my conclusion, that "if slavery was right under some circumstances, it was right under all," a statement by the way which I never made, and thence inferred that slavery [admitting the two first points proved] was, according to my conclusion, [or what he called my conclusion] right under all circumstances.

#### THE QUESTION OF FALSEHOOD.

The question of *falsehood* is now narrowed down to very small limits. In view of the facts above stated, no brother can, honestly, attempt to make it appear, that I misstated his argument, except it be in this one particular, "under all circumstances." Now let us see whether this is a "*total* misrepresentation of his argument." It is certainly not a misrepresentation of his argument, so far as Jewish and American slavery are concerned; for he contended that circumstances justified slavery in both these cases. This has been proved from his written speech. Thus you see according to Br. Winans, it *was* right under the law, and it *is* right under the gospel. What other standard have we by which to test principles and actions? Now when a brother affirms that slavery was right in the Jewish Church, that it is right in the Gospel Church, in the United States; and that *deacons*, *elders*, and *BISHOPS* ought to be *SLAVE HOLDERS*—how much injustice, I ask, is done him, by asserting that he contends that slavery is right under all circumstan-

ces? In what part of the country does it exist where Br. W. would say it is wrong? But according to Br. W.'s testimony, it was *American slavery* that was the subject in dispute. And it was *AMERICAN SLAVERY* that I had in view when I attributed to Br. Winans the sentiment that slavery was right under all circumstances—though I said *SLAVERY*, without any qualification. Had I said *American slavery*, how much should I have erred? He said if circumstances ever justified slavery, they now existed in the South; he made no exceptions. He had just proved to his own satisfaction, that circumstances did once justify it.

Now did he not say what amounted to saying that slavery in the South is now right under all circumstances? He did not use these *very words*; but I put it to *him*, I put it to any *candid man*, to say, whether his justification of Southern slavery without making any exception, did not amount to this? If it be said, he admitted slavery in the "abstract" was wrong, I ask; where did slavery ever exist in the abstract? Jewish slavery *did* not exist in the abstract; American slavery *does* not exist in the abstract—"circumstances" justify it, according to Br. W., in both cases. And where did slavery ever exist without *circumstances*?

Br. Winans did use the words "under all circumstances" in his first speech as he has acknowledged in his *written* speech; but he and others say (and this is probably the fact, though I did not understand it so at the time) that he connected these words with what he took to be my conclusion. Now what is the amount of my error in *reporting these words*, without mentioning in that connexion a false conclusion which he attributed to me? Had I understood at the time, that he made his inference that slavery is "right under all circumstances," to depend in part upon a conclusion which he attributed to me, I should have so reported, and denied the false conclusion; but I did not so understand him. Not expecting to reply to him, I only noted a few things in his speech which struck me the most forcibly. I heard the words that slavery is right under all circumstances; and my

attention being probably called another way for the moment, I did not clearly understand the connexion.

#### THE CONTRADICTION.

The reviewer tries to find a contradiction between my statement of Br. Winans' argument in the *address*, and in my *defence*. But in the *address*, I stated the argument as briefly as possible, and as I then understood it. In the *defence* I said, "his argument, when stated *a little more at length*," &c.; and then stated it as others had informed me they understood it. I stated it the first time according to the best light I had; and I stated it the second time a little more at length, with the additional light which I had received from other brethren. Where, then, is the contradiction? What becomes of the reviewer's display about "affirming, conceding, and then reaffirming the whole?"

#### CONCLUSIONS.

The controversy upon this argument may be summed up as follows:

1. I still affirm that Br. W. did attempt to show that both Jewish and American slavery were right. He said "*perpetual, hereditary slavery*" was "*permitted and regulated*" by God; "that circumstances did justify it in the case of the Hebrews;" and, "if circumstances can justify it, they existed in the South." Now for attributing to him these VERY SENTIMENTS, part<sup>ly</sup> in other words, Rev. N. Bangs charges me with falsehood over and over again; and this, he says, "was the PALPABLE FALSEHOOD of which the General Conference voted the writer guilty." If the General Conference did vote me guilty of palpable falsehood for this, I leave it with my brethren to say, with how much propriety they did it. But this is not the fact. The laboring point with Br. W. and the General Conference was, that I attributed to him the sentiment that slavery is right under all circumstances. In relation to this, I remark, 2dly. That, notwithstanding my opponent made slavery to be right in Judea, and right in the Southern States, right under the law and under the Gospel, still I ought not to have attributed to him *unqualifiedly* the sentiment that slavery is right under all circumstances; though I had in view

*American slavery*, which he had expressly justified by "circumstances." I sincerely thought, at the time, that I gave his real sentiments. And I do not now see why his statements do not *imply* ALL I attributed to him, at least so far as American slavery is concerned, which was the matter then in dispute.

3. Had I connected with the words, "under all circumstances," the false conclusion which he attributed to me, all would have been right; but this I did not understand at that time. Had I understood it, I should have exposed its fallacy. If I erred in attributing to Br. W. a sentiment which did not belong to him, he has erred in attributing to me a false conclusion. This he did by mistake, I presume. And a mistake is allowable in him: I will not publish him through the country as guilty of "*falsehood*" for this and other errors which I have pointed out.

Now I ask, what have I done that justly subjects me to the charge of falsehood, "palpable falsehood?" And why must I be so published throughout the United States? Are not all debaters and controversialists constantly committing errors in the statement of each others views? Is the reviewer without fault in this respect? Is it treating a brother in the church well, to publish him all over the land as guilty of falsehood, for failing to state an argument correctly? Is this doing as we would be done by? I feel that I have been abused and misrepresented.

#### PITTSBURGH CONFERENCE JOURNAL.

I felt both grieved and surprised, to see the editor of the Pittsburgh Conference Journal endorse the slanderous statements of the reviewer in the following language:

"It is a pity that any circumstances should render it necessary (if indeed necessity can be pleaded) to treat a brother in the church with such a heavy hand as Rev. O. Scott is treated in this review. And yet the severity looks more like that of TRUTH and REASON, than of wrath."

I presume the editor had not a full knowledge of both sides of this subject, when he penned the above sentences. And if this examination shall convince him that there is not so much "*truth and reason*" in the severity with which I am treated, as he might at first have

supposed, I hope he will do me the *justice*, and himself the *honor*, to retract this cruel insinuation.

#### TESTIMONY OF THE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

The reviewer pretends that the passage of the condemnatory resolution by the General Conference is indisputable evidence that the pamphlet was false. But good men may err, and err widely, especially when under great excitement. Look at the circumstances under which the resolution was drawn up and passed. It was drawn up by Br. Winans, in the excitement of the moment, strongly worded, and supported by a very inflammatory speech. Most of the General Conference were under great excitement. They were prepared for almost any measure against abolition, not to say *abolitionists*; for they condemned the *sin*, though they let the sinner escape! And it was by this kind of management that the resolution passed at all. The excitement that prevailed in the General Conference, while that resolution was under discussion, was scarcely surpassed by the excitement in Congress, when the resolutions were pending to censure the Hon. J. Q. Adams, for "giving color to an idea," by asking whether a petition would be admissible from slaves! Mr. Adams had two or three of his colleagues to defend him, and thus escaped without censure. Had O. Scott been as highly favored, he might have escaped too! My colleagues, however, and several other members, voted against the resolution; but a larger number did not vote at all. And some that did vote for it, made efforts to get it modified; but failing in this, some of them went the whole.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE RESOLUTION.

Rev. D. OSTRANDER, before the resolution was put, moved to refer it to a committee, for the purpose of having it altered. Rev. P. P. SANDFORD spoke in favor of the reference. He said, among other things, that he could not support the pending "resolution, because it charged on the member against whom it was directed, *palpable falsehood*." The reference, however, being warmly opposed by several brethren, the resolution was withdrawn! Rev. M. RUTER ex-

pressed his regret that it was withdrawn, and immediately renewed it. Br. BOWEN, of the Oneida Conference, spoke against the resolution itself, and read a substitute for it, which he intended, at a proper time, to offer. He said he "did not believe that to pass the resolution as it *was*, before the Conference, would be beneficial. Some of the brethren, whilst they thought the brother had not given as full a view of the case as the circumstances called for, yet believed he had acted honestly. In this view, the terms employed in the resolution were not acceptable to them, and they believed others less exceptionable might be used," &c. But the motion to refer was laid on the table! Br. Winans, during the discussion, said, if he had known O. Scott was the author of the address, he would have charged him as O. Scott; but when O. Scott, just before the motion was put, rose and moved to have *his name* inserted in the resolution, in place of "a member," Br. Winans manifested no disposition to insert it; and DR. BANGS *moved to lay this motion on the table!!!* The doctor knew well, and so did the Conference, that if my name was inserted in the resolution, *it could not pass!* And as it was, after the Conference was goaded up to the highest pitch of excitement, only about two thirds of the members voted for it. There were 97 in favor and 19 against, and some thirty who did not vote at all! MARTIN RUTER and others retired without the bar. There were very few if any of the delegates which now compose the Oneida, Genesee, Erie and Black River Conferences, who voted for the resolution. Why could not Brother Ruter and some fifty others, see the "palpable falsehood" and "total misrepresentation," as well as Br. Bangs, and the slave holders, and some others? On that matter, there was a difference of opinion in the General Conference; and at any other time such a resolution could not have passed. Had my name been inserted in it, there would have been a *sinner* as well as a sin to condemn. And it was only by keeping up this *distinction*, that the resolution passed. Brs. Crowder, Winans, and others, insisted that the "*motives*" of the author were not to be *impeached*; O no; the poor pamphlet only was to be con-

demned,—the very pamphlet that the author was not permitted to call after his *own name*! Rev. N. Bangs stated that he “would vote for the resolution as it was, as quickly as if it were clothed in softer terms.” Br. Storrs moved that he and those who voted with him, might be permitted to record their names in the negative; but “this almost no request” was denied them!

#### SPRINGFIELD CONFERENCE.

Has Br. B. in this review admitted the *possibility* of an unintentional error? Not he! Has he forgotten some things that took place at Springfield in 1836? It will be remembered that he published something about the *falsehood* of the address, in the 510th No. of the Christian Advocate. This was considered a serious charge. A council was called to examine into the charge, and he was notified to appear and sustain it if he pleased. He declined to do so, but wrote a letter to Rev. J. A. Merrill, president of the council, disclaiming all *intention* of charging me “with the crime of falsehood, or with an *intention* to deceive.” The committee took into the account also the resolution passed by the General Conference, and after examining into the whole affair, made a report, which was adopted by the Conference, and published. The Conference decided, nearly unanimously, that Rev. N. Bangs’ public attack upon me, “was calculated injuriously to affect my Christian and ministerial character.” But in view of his letter, they were satisfied that he did not intend to charge me with any thing criminal. The following is their report.

“*Report of the Committee on the case of the Rev. O. Scott, accepted by the New England Conference, at its session in Springfield, Mass., held July 13th, 1836, and ordered to be published in the Christian Advocate and Journal, Zion’s Herald, and Zion’s Watchman.*”

“Whereas, a resolution, passed by the late General Conference, at Cincinnati, in reference to an address to that body by one of its members; and also an article published by Dr. N. Bangs in the 510th No. of the Christian Advocate and Journal, referring to the contents of said address, were calculated, it was believed, by a large portion of this community, to fix the charge of falsehood upon the Rev. O. Scott, the avowed author of said address; and whereas it was believed that the cause of piety was likely to suffer injury in consequence of the publication of said resolution and the article above-

mentioned; a committee was called by Rev. J. A. Merrill, presiding elder of Springfield district, to examine the charge supposed to be contained in said article and resolution, and Dr. Bangs was also notified to appear and support said charge so far as it relates to the article published by him, if he was disposed to do so.

“The committee having carefully examined this subject, in view of all the information they have been able to obtain, and in view of a letter from Dr. Bangs to said J. A. Merrill, of the 4th inst., wherein he disclaims having charged brother O. Scott with the *crime* of falsehood, and expressly clears him of all *intention* to deceive; feel bound in faithfulness to the cause of religion and in justice to the parties concerned, to present to the Conference for adoption, the following resolutions:—

“1. *Resolved*, That although the communication in the 510th No. of the Christian Advocate and Journal, was calculated injuriously to affect the Christian and ministerial character of Rev. O. Scott, yet we are entirely satisfied from Dr. Bangs’s letter in relation to this subject, that he did not intend to charge brother Scott with criminal falsehood, but only to express his opinion that he had been unintentionally led into unfair and incorrect statements in the said address.

“2. *Resolved*, That we have full evidence that the General Conference, in the resolution passed by that body upon the above-mentioned address, *never intended* to attribute to brother Scott the *sin of falsehood*.

“3. *Resolved*, That in the opinion of this Conference, the discrepancy of views, and any apparent discrepancy of statements between these brethren on the important subjects of slavery and of abolition, have arisen from the fallibility of human judgment, in connection with an ardent zeal to promote their honest views of these absorbing subjects.

“4. *Resolved*, as the sense of this Conference, That we ought carefully to avoid the use of harsh and severe epithets which seem to impugn the motives of an opponent, where only an unintentional error or mistake has been committed.

“5. *Resolved*, That in view of all the facts in connection with this case, *Brother Scott’s character for truth and veracity stands fair and unimpeached.* J. A. MERRILL, *Chairman*.

J. T. BURRILL, *Secretary*.

“Springfield, July 19, 1836.”

#### NO CORRECTIONS REQUIRED.

The Conference required of me no confessions or corrections whatever; and I made none. The reviewer talks about a confession and promise of correction which I made in my conference respecting the statement of brother Winans’ argument. I suppose he makes the story out of the following. Soon after the General Conference, and before the Springfield Conference, I published notes of brother Winans’ speech, which I took at the time of its delivery. My design was to show, not that the address was

perfectly correct in every particular, but that it corresponded with my notes. A brother stated in that Conference, that he thought the publication of the notes had the appearance of being designed to show, that the address was, in every particular, perfectly correct. I told him that that was not my design—my design being simply to show, that if there was any mistake, it was in *taking the notes*, and not in writing out the address. The notes were taken *before* there was any thought of publishing any thing upon the subject; of course there could be no *design* to misrepresent. I then observed, that I had admitted, on the floor of the General Conference, that I had not, probably, *fully* stated one of the arguments of brother Winans in a single point. I admitted the same there; and promised that I would state to the public that my design in publishing the *notes* was as above explained, which I did.—*The Conference required nothing at my hands on the subject.*

That I acknowledged, in my own Conference, that I had misrepresented brother Winans' argument, and promised to correct it, *is not true*. The reviewer is mistaken in this matter. I never acknowledged any thing in my own Conference, that I did not at the General Conference; nor any thing in either place, that I have not in this examination. I have always admitted, since my attention was called to the subject, that one of brother Winans' arguments, in a single point, I did not, probably, state *fully*. I acknowledge this *now*, and *no more*. I never promised any where to make any correction, any further than to say (at the request of an individual brother) that the publication of the notes was not designed to justify the address in every particular. What is said about "my own Conference," is calculated to leave the impression, that the *Conference* required something of me, either with respect to *confession*, or *correction*, or *both*, in relation to the address; whereas such an insinuation is entirely without foundation.

This statement of the reviewer, respecting what took place in my own Conference, is *incorrect*; as has been shown above. I do not charge him in this and other particulars which have been alluded to, with *intentional* mis-

representation; but I do say, his statements are not so accurate as they ought to have been—especially as he makes a brother "an offender for a word."

#### WHY ARE OUR ERRORS MAGNIFIED?

*Why*, is the reviewer, alias Rev. N. Bangs, trying to injure my character, by such insinuations and statements, in Conferences, and through the press?—After his untimely and uncalled for thrust, at the Genesee Conference, an influential member of another Conference, (not an abolitionist) stated, that he considered the attack *ungenerous*. And so far as I could learn, there was but *one opinion* at the Genesee Conference among abolitionists and anti-abolitionists, respecting this unbrotherly and far fetched thrust.

I have never *intended* to injure Br. Bangs; and if I have ever done so, I exceedingly regret it. I treasure up nothing against him, notwithstanding all he has said and done in my case. I doubt not his intentions and motives have been good—but I do think he is one of the last men to hang a brother for an *unintentional* error.

It does appear to me, that the errors of the abolitionists, however small, are thought to be almost unpardonable, while the errors of their opponents, are scarcely noticed! "To err is human"—*a fact which our opponents would do well to remember. They seem to require perfection in us, while they set us an imperfect example!*

#### MISSTATEMENTS OF ANTI-ABOLITIONISTS, NOT NOTICED.

Soon after the last General Conference, W. A. Smith, a member of that body, published through the columns of the Virginia Conference Sentinel, that Br. Fisk was elected to the Episcopacy, "by the *almost unanimous* suffrage of the General Conference." This statement in plain language, is a *falsehood*. Rev. W. Fisk was elected by a majority of *one or two votes only!* Mr. Smith's attention was called to this error immediately—but he has never, to my knowledge, corrected it. He was on the spot at the time of the election, and there is therefore little excuse for this "palpable" misstatement, not to say "falsehood." But has the reviewer ever re-

viewed Mr. Smith's statement? Not to my knowledge. It is as much as he can do to take care of the falsehoods of the abolitionists.

Now which is the greater error,—to say that our bishop elect was elected by an "almost unanimous" vote, or to say that a brother, who had attempted to prove that Jewish and American slavery were right, held that slavery was right under all circumstances? Especially when American slavery, which he had expressly defended, *was meant*? But Rev. W. A. Smith is not an abolitionist; that alters the case!

#### PROPOSITION.

I will here pledge myself to take a *single column* of some of Rev. N. Bangs' late productions, and point out more misstatements in matters of fact, than have ever been charged to my address, which made some ten or twelve closely printed newspaper columns! And this matter shall be submitted to any number of brethren, one half to be selected

by Br. Bangs, and the other half by myself. I hope he will either accept of this proposition, or cease to reiterate his charges of "palpable falsehood" against me, from one end of the country to the other. I have no objection to his publishing the resolution of the General Conference every week if he pleases, but he has charged me with what the General Conference never did, and with what Rev. W. Winans never did, as I have clearly shown in the foregoing pages. Br. Winans' charges were mostly unfounded and cruel; but Br. Bangs' are much more so, for he adds to the former.

I feel that I have been greatly abused by the reviewer, and that he solemnly owes to me, to himself, to God, to the church, and the world, to make *retraction*.

The foregoing statements have been made, I humbly trust, in the fear of God, and with a view to the day of final account.

### PART IV.—CONFERENCE RIGHTS.

It is a matter both of regret and surprise, that there should exist a necessity for DEFENDING the RIGHT of a body of Christian ministers, in their associate capacity, to bear their testimony against *sin*; but such is the awful fact! Tell it not in heathen countries!

#### HOW LIBERTY MAY BE LOST.

"A nation," says the renowned Montesquieu, "may lose its liberties in a *day*, and not miss them for a *century*." And Vattel says, "It is against *silent* and *slow* attacks, that the nation should be particularly on its guard." There is much truth in the above sentences ap-

plied to the nation, and not less when applied to the church. The Roman Catholic Church was undoubtedly once as *pure*, and perhaps more republican, than the Methodist Episcopal Church now is. Our bishops have power enough, when kept rigidly to the charter. The natural tendency of power, both in church and state, is to accumulate. The least innovations, therefore, should be *promptly* and *firmly* resisted. Otherwise, these innovations will become *precedents*, and *USAGE* will make them *LAW*. It was by slow and almost imperceptible advances that popery established itself in the bosom of St. Peter's Church. No



body of men not even pagans, would ever have submitted, *at once*, to the anti-Christian claims of popery. The first departures of the Romish Church from primitive Gospel simplicity, were undoubtedly considered small matters,—not very alarming. These innovations plead the good of the church. The religious character of the first innovators was a sufficient guaranty that the Church would not suffer in their hands. And, besides, the “peace of the Church” would forbid opposition and agitation for *small causes*. And there never was, perhaps, any period in the history of the Catholic Church, when the majority did not consider the *present innovation* small, compared with past usages, and that it was better to submit, in this instance, than to rebel, or agitate the Church by remonstrances and conventions. Thus popery, by many steps, with long intervals between them, rose to an eminence, that it never could have reached at one leap. The peace of the Church, however corrupt that Church might be, was considered at all periods in the history of Romanism, a *paramount object*. That was not to be disturbed, come what might. But had “*slow and silent attacks*” been sedulously watched and promptly resisted, had no innovation been considered *small*, where principle was involved, that Church would not have missed her liberties a “century” after they were “lost,” if, indeed, she has missed them at all. But whether she has missed them or not, *they are gone*, and have been for centuries! And it was by “*silent and slow attacks*” that they disappeared!

#### WE ARE NOT AGAINST THE EPISCOPACY.

We have never written a sentence against our own church government, nor any powers that *properly belong* to the bishops; and we do not now wish to utter a word of complaint on this score. We are willing our bishops should exercise all the powers which the Discipline gives them; and this, we think, should satisfy them. It is to the exercise of powers that are *not* found in the charter, that we have objected, and do still object. We have believed, and do still believe, that the strong claims which some of our bishops have laid to *doubtful* and

*disputed powers*, not pretending to substantiate their claims by any better evidence than *implication* and *inference*, give just cause of alarm! Admit they are good men; admit they have a good object in view; admit that from the maintenance of these claims the Church will not be likely to suffer much while the present generation is on the stage, and perhaps never from this particular thing; yet, if doubtful and disputed powers are yielded to-day, similar claims with no better authority may be put in to-morrow; and the present innovation may be used hereafter as a stepping-stone to claims which would now cause the Church to shrink back with horror, but which will then not be considered, perhaps, greater innovations than the present claims of the episcopacy are now, by many, considered. It is “against silent and slow attacks” that we should be on our guard. It is said that “that which is best administered is best;” and these is some truth in this remark. And yet good principles should never be sacrificed to the claims of power, because *good men are in authority*. We cannot tell what an administration will be to-morrow by what it is to-day. It is safest and best never to trust men in authority with powers that *can* be abused; or, at any rate, these matters should be as well guarded as possible. And especially ought we to be careful about granting doubtful and disputed claims, when they are almost certain to be abused! And it certainly would be modest, to say the least, for men who allowedly possess as much power as our bishops do, not to *urge* their claims to disputed and doubtful powers with too much tenacity, against the solemn judgment of annual conferences. And when such things are done, I say again, there is just cause of alarm! They show a *disposition for power*, which should be watched with jealousy.

An equally unfavorable omen, is the disposition manifested by many of our brethren to grant such claims. This, however, is owing, in part, to the fact, that these powers are to be applied, *at first*, to a cause which to them is exceedingly hateful. And how they will be applied hereafter, is a matter with which they do not seem to concern themselves.

# THE ADMINISTRATION OF OUR CHURCH OFFICERS MAY BE EXAMINED.

The administration of our Church officers is a matter that concerns all our ministers and members, as well as the General Conference; and we be to us, if we ever live to see the day, that the *official acts* of our superintendents may not be laid before the *whole Methodist body*! Let us never fear an open and fair discussion of any important principle or doctrine.

It is comparatively an easy thing to justify a measure that opposes what we dislike, though that measure may not be perfectly constitutional; yet, when a wrong principle is once admitted, there is no knowing where its operation will end. If a bishop has a right to refuse to put a question to-day, on the subject of slavery, he may to-morrow refuse to put any question he pleases. And are we prepared to establish such a precedent, on *any subject*? Are the anti-abolitionists, or even our *southern brethren*, prepared for this?

If the president of an annual conference is obliged to put *only* such motions as he *pleases*, *what rights*, I ask, are left to the conferences?

The Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church opposes slavery; it puts down slavery with other *crimes* and *immoralities*. "The buying and selling men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them," is expressly prohibited in our general rules; and yet we may not now speak out, even in the free States, as annual conferences, the language and sentiments of our Discipline. The Discipline represents slavery as a great evil,—a *sin*. But it has been decided by two of our bishops, that to oppose, in a conference capacity, this "great evil;" and thus oppose what our Discipline opposes, is not proper conference business, and would be arraying ourselves against the General Conference! Is the General Conference, then, against the Discipline? If so, it is time to inquire which we ought to obey.

No one, however, pretends that the General Conference has made any law on the subject of slavery contrary to the Discipline. And yet it is pretended that the doings of our late General Conference, in passing a resolution against "modern abolition," and in putting

forth a "Pastoral Address," which contained similar sentiments, are "*virtually a law*." But if the General Conference intended that their *advice* should be understood and received *as law*, why did they not give it the form of law, and annex a penalty to it? It is not likely that it entered into the heart of any other member of the General Conference, that a bishop ever would, in consequence of the address, refuse to put a motion to the vote, in the annual conference, expressing an opinion on the subject of slavery. This business is undoubtedly *all an after thought*. Had the General Conference intended to *oblige* the bishops to refuse to permit the annual conferences to express an opinion on the sin and evils of slavery, why did they not say so? But they have said no such thing. They have not given the bishops, *as such*, *EVEN ANY ADVICE* on the subject! And yet two of them, at least, have assumed the astonishing power over annual conferences, which prevents them from exercising their rights of conscience and opinion, by speaking out their sentiments, in a conference capacity, against an evil prohibited in our Church regulations! And to justify themselves in these unprecedented and alarming measures, they pretend to construe the "advice" of the General Conference into a law, or something of that nature, which obliges them to take the course they have taken! But they have no shadow of authority from the General Conference, for the measures they have adopted. That body *may* sanction their course, and it *may not*; that will depend upon "*circumstances*."

The General Conference *never even advised them* to violate, as presiding officers, all parliamentary usages? They are only advised, in common with other brethren, "to abstain from all abolition movements and associations;" but they are not advised to *FORCE* annual conferences to abstain! The course, therefore, which some of our bishops have taken, as *presiding officers*, is without *law*, without *precedent*, and without *advice*! For the unparliamentary and unprecedented course which they have taken, *they alone are responsible*!

## PROPER CONFERENCE BUSINESS.

The bishop, as president, has no right

to refuse to do the proper duties of the chair; and the proper duties of the chair extend to all proper conference business; and *all business, which is not contrary to the Discipline, and which is in accordance with the genius of Methodism, is proper conference business.* Bishop Hedding has defined proper conference business to be, "such business as is specified in the Discipline, either by express provision, implication, or inference;" and in such matters he said he *was under obligation* to put all questions to the vote.

It is true, the doctrine of conference rights must be understood with some restrictions and limitations. An annual conference has no right to travel out of its proper sphere. This is admitted on all hands. The question in dispute is, what is its proper sphere? Here we must refer to the charter. Whatever is prohibited there, should of course be avoided; and whatever is enjoined there, should be attended to. And if any matters are left optional with the Conference, it is for the *Conference*, not the bishop, to say, whether they shall be attended to or not. Now, what are the facts in the case? I answer: The Discipline nowhere says, "thus far shalt thou go and no farther." There are several items of business laid down, in answer to the question, "What is the method wherein we *usually* proceed in the yearly conferences?" But nothing is laid down in the positive form; but admitting this were the fact, there is no intimation given, that the Conference may not *as properly* attend to any other business as to those items. Indeed, the business of the conferences is seldom, if ever done in the order there brought to view. It is well known that various items of business are done in the conferences, not named in the Discipline, and even before those named are done. Most of the outline of business mentioned in the Discipline was drawn up many years ago, when the connection was young and the conferences had little business to do, compared with what they have now. A few items have been added of late years, but not all that are attended to in every conference, and which are considered *as proper conference business* as any thing that is done. New

things are constantly coming up, and our business is increasing every year.

The plainest principles of common sense show, that in the very nature of things, a body of Christian ministers must have a right, in their associated capacity, to express an opinion on what they believe to be a question of moral reform. And the Discipline not only provides, "that every person, on these occasions," [at the conferences] may "speak freely whatever is in his heart," but expressly declares, "that we are as much as ever convinced of the *great evil of slavery*;" and "the buying of men, women, and children, with an *intention* to enslave them," is as strongly prohibited in the Discipline as drunkenness and fighting. To pretend, therefore, that the Discipline of the M. E. Church gives no authority to a company of Methodist preachers, in conference assembled, to oppose what it opposes, is absurd!

Who will pretend that an annual conference has no right to pass resolutions on *temperance*? But so far as our Discipline is concerned, we have the same right to oppose slavery, as we have drunkenness.

#### DUTIES OF BISHOPS.

The bishops are to "*preside* in the conferences." But what is meant by "*presiding* over the conferences?" Does it mean to sit in the chair and *refuse* to perform its duties, and thus nullify the action of an annual conference, or rather prevent the conference from acting at all? Can he decide all questions, and refuse to admit an appeal from *his* decision? So we have not learned Methodism; and we look in vain to the Discipline or usage for such authority! There is no "implication" or "inference" that can justify such measures!

It has been contended, that, because the Discipline provides that the bishop "*shall* allow the conferences to sit a week at least," and because he may fix the day for ordaining the preachers, that therefore he has a right to adjourn the conference in a week, and, of course, may so order the business, as to get through in a week. And from this it is argued, that he may prevent the conference from expressing an opinion on the "evils of slavery," &c. Now, admit-

ting that a bishop has the power to adjourn the conference in a week,—it is a power which they do not presume to use, any more than they do their power to appoint the preachers, without the council and advice of the presiding elders.

But I deny that it follows, even if they possess the power to adjourn the conference in a week, that therefore they have a right to prevent an annual conference from expressing an opinion, on a great moral question, *any time during that week*. While the conference *does sit*, it is not for the president to say what *shall be done*, and what *shall not be done*, or what shall be done *first* and what *last*. He can show no authority from the charter for such dictation, either expressed or implied. The president may introduce business, and the conference may do it, or not. Any member may introduce business, and the conference may do it or not. The conference is not *obliged* to receive a member on trial, or continue one on trial, or admit one into full connection. Neither is the conference *obliged* to elect any brother to deacons' or elders' orders. Much less is it obliged to do these things *first*, or when the bishop may dictate. The Christian Advocate and Journal holds, that the conference is not obliged to elect any brother to orders.

The bishop may talk of being sent to the conference to do certain business—but the *Discipline specifies no business which HE is to do in the conferences, except to "preside,"* and is it presiding in the conference, to sit in the chair and refuse to do the duties of president, and thus prevent the whole conference from acting? This, I must say, is a *new way* to "preside" in a Methodist conference. The fact that he is responsible to the General Conference, does not alter his duty as president of an annual conference. The claims of an annual conference upon him as *president*, are the same as they would be if he were elected by the Conference. The *manner* in which a president may be elected, cannot alter his duties, as *president*.

The duties of our bishops, *in the conferences*, are *simply* to "preside." No other duty is specified in the charter, either by "express provision, implication, or inference." Should the General Conference please to do so, it might

perhaps encumber our bishops with new and unparliamentary rules, as presidents. But no such rules and regulations have yet been made. Our bishops are, therefore, under the broad direction to "preside in the conferences;" and they may ascertain their duty, as *presidents*, from history, analogy, and usage. But here, I am confident, they will look in vain to find authority for the powers which they have exercised over some of the conferences.

#### PRIVATE AND OFFICIAL RIGHTS.

It has been said, that bishops have rights as well as the conferences; and that, therefore, they have a right to refuse to put questions to the vote, &c. But let it be observed, that their rights, as *private individuals*, are one thing, and their rights as *public men*, another. When men accept of an office, they are under obligation to perform the duties of that office. They may resign it when they please; but as long as they hold it, they have no right to neglect the duties which it imposes. One of the duties imposed upon our bishops, is, "to preside in the conferences." And as there is no intimation, that the term is here used out of its common acceptation, and as the duties of a president of an annual conference are no where particularly *restricted*, we have a right to expect of him the faithful performance of the duties of the chair in all conference business. It by no means follows, that the chairman or president of a deliberative body approves of all the questions which, as president, it is his duty to put for adoption. Our Discipline gives to our bishops no veto in the conferences. When they can find this authority in the "charter," it will be time enough to exercise it. They have no *personal* rights secured, as presidents, at the expense of the rights of whole conferences. We all have rights as *individuals*; the bishops have rights as *bishops*; and the conference has rights as a *conference*.

In accepting their office, and becoming public men, our bishops have voluntarily relinquished certain private rights, for others conferred upon them by their office; which office imposes upon them other obligations and duties. For a bishop, as president of an annual conference, in the exercise of his official rights,

to lay claim to all his *private* rights, is absurd. To suppose that the president of an annual conference has the same right to *refuse to act* in business which the conference wish to do, that he would have if he were only a member of the conference, is a *great error*. By carrying out his claim to *private rights*, in his official capacity, he oppresses his brethren, and robs the conference of their rights. A member of the conference may refuse to act, and by this refusal affect no one's rights but his own; but it is not so with the president.

Suppose the Congress of the United States should issue its solemn judgment in the form of advice, that it is inexpedient to agitate the abolition question, and exhort all the people "wholly to refrain." The Massachusetts Legislature assembles; a member introduces a resolution, saying that slavery is a "great evil," recommending to Congress the *immediate abolition* of slavery in the District of Columbia, and the territories. "But stop," says the speaker of the House, "that subject has been put to rest by the *General Government*: I cannot put the question to the vote—IT IS NOT IN ORDER; AND I SHALL ALLOW OF NO APPEAL FROM MY DECISION, TO THE HOUSE, BECAUSE IN MY JUDGMENT IT INVOLVES A QUESTION OF LAW!!" Now, who does not see, that this is precisely the ground taken by some of our bishops! No matter by whom the speaker is elected, or to whom he is responsible—no matter by whom our bishops have been elected, or to whom they are responsible—their duty *in the chair* is substantially the same in both cases. In the case supposed, the question is not a "legislative, judicial, or executive" matter. It simply expresses an opinion on the evil of slavery, and the duty of immediate abolition. But the speaker of the House pleads that he *has "rights,"* that "he only claims the *right to govern himself*,"—and that for the House to require him to put that question is "usurpation," and "claiming the right to govern him." Would not his refusal to put such a question be considered an unexampled "usurpation," and claiming the right to govern the whole House? Neither the president of a deliberative or legislative body has any right to *govern himself*, so far as to refuse to do the pro-

per duties of the chair, while he fills it. He has no right to "govern himself," in *SUCH A WAY*, as to oppress a multitude of others! If he desires the rights of a *private individual*, he may obtain them by becoming a private individual: but let him not suppose that *as a public servant* he can put forth, at all times, independent action, and govern himself by his *private opinions*. Such a doctrine would indeed be of "DESTRUCTIVE TENDENCY," and "SUBVERSIVE OF ORDER!"

#### CONSISTENCY OF THE DOCTRINE OF RIGHTS.

The doctrine of human rights is always consistent with itself. It is therefore impossible, in the very nature of things, that one man can have a right to deprive a hundred other men of their rights. Annual conferences have claims upon the bishop, *as president*, which he has not upon them. Both the bishop and the conferences have rights, but they are *dissimilar*. The office of president is created by the conferences in General Conference assembled, and created for the *use and benefit* of the conferences. He therefore, who voluntarily accepts this office, promises at the same time to perform its duties. He at that moment relinquishes certain private rights, and comes into possession of other rights, peculiar to his office. The Church has placed him in a responsible relation to herself. Her rights are now intimately connected with the faithful performance of his duty. If therefore, by unfaithfulness to his trust, or by exercising his *private rights*, in his public and official character, he deprives her of her rights, *he takes advantage of his office for the most unjustifiable purposes*.

#### WILL THE BISHOPS CARRY OUT THEIR PRINCIPLES?

There has never been any dispute between the bishops and the conferences, concerning proper conference business, till since the subject of anti-slavery has been introduced into the conferences. It would not now be strange if the bishops should apply their principles to other matters. Indeed, such an application is to be expected. In fact, such an application actually has been made, in *principle*, though not, so far as I know, in practice.

Bishop Hedding said, not long since, that the business of the Auburn Banner, which had occupied two or three sessions at least, in each of three annual conferences, was not proper conference business; and that he was under no obligation to put such business to the vote. But has he ever refused to perform the duties of the chair in such matters? Not he. Has he refused to let this business come on *before* the matters specified in the Discipline were attended to? Never! Three whole sessions or more, were consumed on this business, in the Oneida and Genesee conferences, in 1837, before the examination of characters was finished; and in the last-named conference, three sessions were consumed on the Banner, before the examination of characters was *scarcely commenced*!

But Bishop Hedding is not alone in this business. Did not bishop Waugh, a year ago, at the Black River, Oneida and Genesee Conferences, attend to this same *unconstitutional* business?—And did he not put motions to the vote, to *go into this* "Conference paper" affair, and that too, after the General Conference had "*affectionately and earnestly requested the annual conferences NOT TO ESTABLISH ANY MORE CONFERENCE PAPERS?*" See new Discipline, page 185.

Did not the very man who is so tenacious of "*advice*," disregard, in these three instances, a provision of the Discipline, as above? Bishop Waugh has said the Discipline "*defines* the business to which the action of an annual conference *extends*." Where in that definition does he find any thing about the "Auburn Banner?" Or rather does he not know that the Discipline has EXPRESSLY OPPOSED the setting up of the Auburn Banner, and all other new conference papers? And did not this same Bishop, at the last session of the Maine Conference, put resolutions to establish a *conference paper* in Portland? The paper, it is true, had been published by a company of private brethren for some time; but where is the DISCIPLINE for *conference action* in the premises? How is Bishop Waugh to answer to the next General Conference for the part he has taken in four annual conferences in establishing conference papers contrary to Discipline? But, suppose, for the sake

of the argument, that nothing has been done in those cases *contrary* to Discipline; where, I ask, is there any Discipline for such action? Where is the "*THUS SAITH THE GENERAL CONFERENCE?*" If the Discipline defines the business to which the action of an annual conference "*extends*," as has been asserted, then all this Banner and Journal business is null and void, being unconstitutional! I would not be understood, as being opposed to the Banner or Journal. *I am not opposed to either of them.* I am in hopes they will both yet be valuable auxiliaries in the cause of the bleeding slave. I have only alluded to the connexion of the Bishops with these matters, to show their inconsistency, in some of their official acts.

#### THE ARGUMENT.

I think it has been made fully to appear, that the Conferences are not only authorized by "implication and inference," but also by the express provisions of the Discipline, to oppose slavery. Indeed, the case is almost too clear to need proof. While our Discipline remains as it is, we contend that we have a *right* to pass anti-slavery resolutions; and that if the president is under obligation to put any resolution to vote, he is under obligation to put anti-slavery resolutions. And if his office lays him under *no obligations*, the sooner we know it the better. We had supposed, that preachers, deacons, elders, presiding elders, and bishops, were under certain obligations peculiar to their office. And must we now be forced to believe that bishops are a favored class, who may do what they please and no more? Must we believe that they have a constitutional right to prevent a body of Christian ministers, in conference assembled, from opposing the vilest system of oppression that ever saw the sun? Must we believe that it is a part of the duty of the president of the Methodist Conference to sit in the chair and refuse to act, or refuse to let the Conference act on a moral question? And that he is "*presiding* in the Conference" when he is doing this? No; we can never believe this.

To pretend that a bishop is responsible for the doings of an Annual Conference, is as absurd as to pretend that the

speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States is responsible for the doings of that body. Our Discipline requires no more in the former case, than the laws of the country do in the latter.

Bishop Waugh stated in the New England Conference in 1837, that he did not doubt that the anti-slavery brethren were "*most conscientious*." How, then, can he consent to lay such heavy burdens upon their consciences? Will he say that if the Northern Conferences speak out against slavery, the Southern Conferences will separate from us? And has it come to this, that a great moral evil must not be opposed, lest it cause a division in the M. E. Church? Is there not also a danger that if he continues to oppress and grieve his brethren in the free States—the brethren whom he believes to be "*most conscientious*"—it may produce a rupture in the northern section of the Church? Or, is it of no consequence what becomes of the abolitionists, provided we keep peace with slave holders? More than one third of the preachers in the sixteen Annual Conferences in the free States, are now decided abolitionists; and the number is daily increasing. These brethren have rights—rights of conscience—rights of opinion—and rights which they are not willing tamely to relinquish. They all feel grieved with the course which has been taken in some of the Conferences, by two of our bishops. We have no wish either to leave the Church, or to treat our worthy superintendents disrespectfully; but we feel as though we *might*, and as though we *ought*, affectionately and plainly to remonstrate with them upon the course they have taken.

#### A PLAIN STATEMENT OF FACTS.

An unprecedented and most fearful crisis has arrived in the annals of Methodism! Two of our bishops have *assumed rights*, which, if carried out and applied to all parts of our beautiful superstructure, would prove its destruction. In *three several instances*, have Annual Conferences, since the last General Conference, been deprived of their right to express an opinion on a moral question—and a question too, involving the dearest interest of *seventy thousand* of our own church members, and of

nearly *two and a half millions* of our countrymen!

#### N. H. CONFERENCE IN 1835.

Nearly three years ago, when a resolution was introduced at the commencement of the N. H. Conference, to appoint a committee on slavery, Bishop EMORY, who was in the chair, made no objection to the appointment of a committee on that subject—and he did not oppose the reading of the report some two days before the Conference adjourned. But when a motion was made for its adoption, he did refuse to put it to the vote—yet, when it was moved to go into a committee of the whole, he decided, that the motion was in order—he put it, and called a brother to the chair. A motion was then made to adopt the report, and carried by a vote of 57 to 8. In this instance, the decisive vote of the Conference was heard, in a committee of the whole, but not in a conference capacity, with the bishop in the chair, *as should have been the case*. Here may be found, perhaps, the *first innovation upon Conference rights*. But this was a small innovation compared with those that have taken place since. In this instance, a committee was appointed without opposition, and without limitations or conditions—but when the question came up for the adoption of the report, the bishop refused to *act*, though he did not refuse to *let the Conference act*. This same bishop, who is probably now in heaven, did not refuse to put anti-abolition resolutions in the Maine Conference, a few days previous—no, nor yet did he refuse to *draft those resolutions with his own hand*! Neither have other bishops refused to put anti-abolition resolutions. *That alters the case!*

#### N. E. CONFERENCE IN 1836.

At the New England Conference, in 1836, when a resolution was introduced to appoint a committee on slavery and abolition, Bishop Hedding stated, after it was read, that, had he known the character of the resolution, he should not have permitted it to be introduced *at that time*, as it would bring on debate, &c., thus clearly claiming the *right* to reject it, had he pleased to do so—a right which Bishop Emory did not pretend that he possessed the year before.

The resolution, however, was adopted, and the committee was appointed without any conditions or restrictions. It did not occur to Bishop Hedding himself, as it would seem, at that time, that he had a right to refuse to *put* the motion after it was read, for the appointment of a committee! At any rate, if he believed then, that he possessed the *right*, he did not think it *expedient* to exercise it. In adopting the resolution, the Conference *instructed* their committee to report at their earliest convenience. The committee were ready and offered to make their report two or three days before Conference adjourned, but our good bishop refused to have it read—the order of the Conference to the contrary notwithstanding. Several times after this, did the committee attempt to obey the Conference, by asking leave to present their report, but were refused by the president—and they were finally told, that the report must not be presented till every thing else was done!—Who ever before this heard of a bishop's refusing to let a committee obey the voice of its Conference? Or when before did the president of an annual Conference ever take it upon himself to say, that a committee must not report *when ORDERED* by the Conference?

But this is not all. When at eleven o'clock, on the last evening of the conference, the report was read, the president refused to put a motion for its adoption, unless it could be read over again, and considerable time taken up in discussing it, for there were some portions of it, that he was not certain he could consistently put the question to adopt. This stand, of course, entirely defeated the measure, as it was then near 12 o'clock at night, and the conference were determined to adjourn *sine die*, when they adjourned at all.

Thus ended the attempt in the N. E. Conference, in 1836, to express a sentiment on the subject of slavery and abolition.

And in consequence of this failure, the New Hampshire Conference, which sat immediately after, attempted nothing, but simply to pass a resolution, approving the course of their delegates in the last General Conference. The president hesitated a little when the resolution was offered, inquiring whether it was de-

signed to *approve the conduct of the two brethren who attended the anti-slavery meeting?*

#### THE LETTER TO BISHOP HEDDING.

A letter was addressed to Bishop Hedding, and published soon after—objecting strongly to that part of his administration in the N. E. Conference, which related to slavery and abolition. Bishop Hedding was *addressed*, because, at *that time*, he stood forth more prominently than any other person on the principle objected to; and the letter was *published*, because something of the kind was believed to be called for, the matters discussed involving the interests of our whole connexion. The letter would not have been published at all, had Bishop Hedding stood alone on this *new principle of administration*, and had the N. E. Conference been the only conference that would be likely to suffer from it, and the session in 1836, the only session that would feel its influence. There was no intention on the part of the writer of that letter to injure Bishop Hedding, or to cast the least shade over his moral character.

The letter did not pretend to give the "exact words" of the bishop; and it contained a promise, that if any thing was "incorrect, disrespectful, or too severe, at his suggestion, the proper correction should be *promptly made*." Accordingly, to satisfy bishop Hedding, and at his request, certain corrections, at two different times, have since been made. Not the least item in point of doctrine, however, has ever been retracted.

#### N. E. CONFERENCE IN 1837.

The president of the New England Conference, in 1837, was our respected Bishop WAUGH. He took higher grounds in opposition to conference rights, than any other of our bishops have ever done. The *new measures*, commenced by Bishop Emory in 1835, and adopted, with additions, by Bishop Hedding in 1836, were consummated by Bishop Waugh in 1837! So do innovations increase, when once they are commenced! A majority of the New England Conference had previously determined to have their rights this year, *at all events*. But they did not wish to come in collision



with the bishop, if it were possible to avoid it. They wished to act on *fair principles*, and have him understand them; and they wished to understand him. It being reported, that he would probably oppose any conference action on the subject—that a mutual understanding, if possible, might be had, the anti-slavery preachers assembled the day before conference, and appointed a committee to wait on the bishop, and ascertain, if any opposition was to be expected from him, in presenting certain memorials on the subject of slavery, and referring them to a committee to consider and report thereon. The bishop wished the matter put off till the next morning. To this the committee consented. The next day about seventy members of the conference signed a memorial to the bishop, requesting, *as their right*, the privilege to present the memorials on slavery, with which they were charged, and to refer them to a committee, with instructions to consider and report thereon—as also to *act* on any report said committee might make. Before the bishop's answer was received, the number of signers, to this memorial, was increased to about NINETY! all members of the conference, and constituting a large majority! The bishop postponed his answer two days longer than was at first anticipated, and when it was given, he denied that the conference had a "*right* to appoint a committee to report on said memorials, and also to act on *any* report from such committee!" He considered, "such a doctrine too ABSURD and SUBVERSIVE OF ORDER to be admitted!" He finally agreed that they might present their memorials and refer them to a committee, with the understanding and agreement, that their report should embrace nothing but a simple "memorial to the General Conference of 1840"—and that, even that, "should not be published!!" To these *unreasonable* propositions, the anti-slavery brethren could not agree. They explained to the bishop that they did not wish any "legislative, judicial, or executive action" on the subject of slavery, but simply the privilege, in a conference capacity, of expressing and publishing an *OPINION* on the evils of slavery, and the best means of hastening its peaceful termination."

But these reasonable claims were considered "ABSURD AND SUBVERSIVE OF ORDER!!!"

The next morning, after the Journals were read, a brother asked the bishop *what relation* the memorials that were presented the day before sustained to the conference? *Where* were they?—The bishop declined giving any *definite* answer to the question. It appeared that they had been presented, and a record made of them on the Journals of the Conference; but they had neither been laid on the table, nor referred to a committee!—The brother then made a motion, that it be the sense of this conference that the memorials have been received and are now in the possession of the conference." But this motion the bishop refused to put. He said it *was not in order*. The mover then asked him if there was any appeal from his decision, in this case, on a question of ORDER! He replied in the *NEGATIVE*!

This same bishop, I believe, put a resolution to the vote about three months before, in the Baltimore conference, *construing away* the force of our General rule on slavery. The construction given by that conference to the General rule, embodies the very doctrine by which the foreign slave trade has been formerly justified. The *guilt or innocence* of a person who hereafter violates the rule on slavery in the Baltimore conference, is to be determined by the "attendant circumstances of cruelty, injustice, or inhumanity on the one hand, or of *kind purposes* or *good intentions* on the other." The rule says, that our members *SHALL NOT* buy human beings "with an *intention* to enslave them;" but the Baltimore conference says they may do it with "*kind purposes* or *good intentions*!" Who is to be judge of a man's "*purposes*" and "*intentions*?" Who *can* be judge, but himself?" Who does not see that the Baltimore conference has trampled this rule under foot, and *virtually* destroyed it? And a rule too, which cannot be altered or changed, but by the voice "of three-fourths of all the members of all the annual conferences," and two-thirds of the next General Conference! But the Baltimore conference *alone*, has *nullified*, if not destroyed the rule, so far as it respects themselves; and bishop Waugh has put

the *anti-Methodistical* and *unconstitutional* resolution to the vote!! The doctrine that the Baltimore conference may do what the Discipline *positively* forbids, provided their "purposes are kind and their intentions good," the bishop did not, of course, consider "absurd and subversive of order!" But for an annual conference to speak out against slavery as the Discipline *does*, and as our fathers did, *is not in order*, and there is no appeal from *such a decision*!

## N. H. CONFERENCE IN 1837.

Bishop Hedding, refused to put a motion in the N. H. Conference expressing a sentiment in opposition to the construction which the Baltimore Conference had put upon our General rule on slavery, because he said it would have a tendency to bring the two conferences into *collision*! Our southern conferences may express sentiments and pass resolutions favorable to slavery, but the Northern conferences must not take opposite ground because it will bring them into collision! Slavery may take *its own ground*, and then we must not come into collision with it! Are not these *measures new*! One annual conference may *prostrate* the Discipline on a particular subject, but another may not *sustain it*, because it will make "collision" between the conferences!

Bishop Hedding, also, at the same conference, refused to put a motion for a committee on slavery, unless with the agreement and understanding *that* if the report contained any thing contrary to the Discipline and the advice of the last General Conference, he should not be under obligation to put a motion for its adoption. He had other conditions, but this was the *substance* of the objectionable one. The abolitionists offered to engage, if the report contained any thing *contrary to the Discipline*, he should not be under obligation to put a motion for its adoption. But this would not do? It was not enough to be *Discipline Methodists*, on the subject of slavery! We must also be governed by the "*advice*" of the last General Conference! But is the advice of the last General Conference *AGAINST* the Discipline? If so, which shall we obey "*advice*" or *LAW*? And if not, why did not the bishop consent to have the committee appointed on the

condition, that if their report contained any thing contrary to the Discipline he should not be under obligation to put a motion for its adoption?

In consequence of the failure of the N. E. Conference to express an opinion on slavery, the Maine Conference attempted nothing, though one presiding elder had memorials from some ten quarterly conferences; and other brethren, I believe, had some from their people. A large majority of the conference, however, are abolitionists—and an Anti-Slavery Society was formed among the preachers, of about seventy-five members.

Let the question of conference rights, and the *right* of bishops to prevent conferences from expressing an opinion on a moral question, be freely and fully discussed. If an evil exists, there is no other remedy—or none so good. Will it be said, Nay, but keep still till the next General Conference, and then bring forward your grievances? We mean to do the one, and not to leave the other undone. That the next General Conference may be prepared to *act*, we spread out these matters before our ministry and membership—it being a subject which concerns one as much as another. The doctrine that the bishops are responsible for the acts of the conferences is too absurd to require any refutation. No such thing is known in Methodism. Never were bishops required to answer for the doings of *annual conferences*. No! NEVER.

## REPLY TO REV. S. LUCKEY.

The substance of all that has been or can be said against the right of an annual conference to oppose *sin*, in a conference capacity, is embodied in several long editorials in some of the late numbers of the Christian Advocate and Journal. The principal positions of Bishop Hedding's address are maintained in these articles. This address appears to have been the editor's *text book*. I do not perceive that his long sermons have made the text any clearer. As, however, these articles contain the *entire strength* of all those who oppose conference rights, and defend episcopal prerogatives, it is proper in this place to give them a brief review, especially as the editor has written several columns bearing directly and severely upon one of

our annual conferences. The *substance* of this reply has been published before; but as this Appeal will go into the hands of some who have seen no answer to the Advocate, it is thought best to give to a few of the strictures upon the positions of Rev. S. Luckey, alias, Rev. N. Bangs, Bishop Hedding, and Bishop Waugh, a more permanent form.

#### DEFINITION OF RIGHTS.

In defining "duties, rights, and privileges," the editor of the Advocate, speaking of conferences, says:

"Some things it is their duty to do." And who is to be judge of these duties? "Some things they *may* do." Who is to be judge of these things? "Some things they *ought not to do*." And who is to be judge here? O, the *bishop*, to be sure. He knows what is expedient, and what is inexpedient, though he may be younger and more inexperienced than many members of the conference! "Some things they *may not* do." And who is to be judge in such matters? O, the *bishop*, of course. He is the sole judge of law and order! So, then, it seems an annual conference has *some* rights; but it is the prerogative of the bishop, in all cases to decide what rights they have, what they may do, and what they may not do. Of what use, then, is discipline? The Bishop may construe every thing as he pleases, and from *his decision there can be no appeal*. To admit that the conference has a *right* to do business which is *not contrary* to the Discipline, and which is in accordance with the genius of Methodism, is admitting all that has ever been contended for. Any to deny this, is to deny some of the plainest principles of philosophy and common sense. To admit that an annual conference has a right to give a construction to a rule of discipline, is to admit all that has ever been contended for; and to deny this, is to say that the Baltimore Conference, at its late session, committed a gross unconstitutional act! And this I fully believe. Not, however, because it gave its views of the meaning of a rule, but because it gave such a construction, as virtually destroyed it,—thus instituting new terms of membership, and doing what the General Conference had no right to do, without the concurrence of three fourths of all the

annual conferences. But the editor of the Christian Advocate can see constitution and law outraged by the Baltimore Conference, and remain silent, though he is set for the defence of the church and her institutions!

If an annual conference does any thing unconstitutional, it is responsible not to the bishop but to a higher tribunal. But according to the doctrine laid down by the bishops, and endorsed by the Advocate, the president of the Baltimore Conference is alone responsible for the doings of that body in nullifying the general rule on slavery. What an awful responsibility! The true doctrine, however, evidently is, that an annual conference is responsible for its doings, and the bishop is responsible for his doings. This is the principle on which the General Conference proceeds in examining into the doings of bishops and conferences. This fact the Advocate will not deny.

#### PRESENTATION OF BUSINESS.

If the General Conference instruct the bishops to lay any matter before the annual conferences for their action, it is undoubtedly their duty to do so. And if an annual conference make such a request of a bishop, it is his duty to comply with it.

But the bishops have never even been requested to decline putting motions which go to express a sentiment on the moral character of slavery; and the editor of the Advocate knows this. Why then does he attempt to defend them in this matter?

The Discipline does not make it the duty of the bishops to bring forward any business in the Conferences; but simply "*to preside*" in them. Neither does it say that the Conference *shall* bring forward the business; therefore either the president or any member of the Conference may bring forward any matters which are in accordance with the Discipline. And the Conference has a right to act on any such business when a majority judge best. No item of business is absolutely enjoined by the Discipline on an annual conference. The items of business which are thrown together in the Discipline come under the head,—"*What is the method wherein we usually proceed,*" &c. And the editor of

the Advocate admits that the conference is not obliged even to elect a brother to orders. He says "suppose the bishop have a desire to ordain him—for any imaginable reason—the conference have the right to prevent him, by withholding his election." They have the same right to omit any other specified (not enjoined) item of business. The Rev. S. Luckey's doctrine then is, that an annual conference has no right to do any business except the items specified, and they are not obliged to do even these. The only difference between us is, we say an annual conference has the same right to do any business which is in accordance with Methodism, that it has to do the items specified; inasmuch as the Discipline lays no restrictions upon an annual conference, at least so far as the expression of an opinion is concerned, and inasmuch as the Advocate being judge, the conference is not obliged even to elect a brother to orders. Now, let Br. L. show, *if he can*, that to pass anti-slavery resolutions is not in accordance with Methodism, or that it is contrary to the Discipline. Till he does this, he has not advanced one step. This is the bone of contention between the bishops and the conferences. The bishops claim that they have a right to prevent annual conferences from "expressing an opinion on the moral character of slavery, and the best means for hastening its peaceful termination,"—and Br. Luckey defends them in this position! Though he only calls it defending "*Methodistical order!*"

Will Br. L. have the goodness to tell us *where* the conference is "directed" and "required" to do certain business, as he affirms is the fact? And then will he reconcile these *requisitions* (if, indeed he can find them) with his admission, that the conference may even refuse to elect a brother to orders? And will he tell us also, where, in the Discipline, he finds the "*right*" secured to the bishop to bring forward the business of the conference? and where he gets his authority for affirming that no one may interfere with this right? He has *affirmed* a great many things, but proved *nothing*. Why has he not quoted chapter and verse from the Discipline to support some of his assertions? He has not done this in a single instance, I believe;

and for a very good reason, undoubtedly.

Suppose we agree with him, that the conferences should, as a general thing, do that which is most important, first. Who is to be judge of what was *most important*? Admit that the conference may judge for itself, and we are agreed. But this probably would be considered *too radical*—not "*Methodistical order.*" The editor says, that the bishop is under no obligation to put to the vote any question except "the regular business"—i. e. the few items specified in the Discipline. *Monstrous!* He places the rights of the bishop in one scale, and those of the whole conference in the other; and argues that the bishop has the same claims upon the conference to do any business *he* may wish to have done, as they have upon him to put, *as chairman*, any business they may wish to do. Surprising! No wonder the editor of the Advocate finds fault with all illustrations and analogies upon this subject; for he must know, that naked assertion is the only proof which can be brought to sustain such positions. Has the chairman of a deliberative body the same right to require that body to do any business *he* may wish to have done, as it has to require him to do the duties of the chair, while he fills it? How absurd! And yet this is the tenor of Rev. S. Luckey's reasoning in defending "*Methodistical order!*" Is this the best defence that episcopal prerogatives can boast of? What? A Methodist bishop not only *refuse* to do his duties, but *refuse in such a way*, as to deprive hundreds of Methodist preachers of the privilege of doing theirs! And this usurpation over men's consciences, on moral questions, claimed to be "*Methodistical order!!*"

"If one conference errs," says the Advocate, "it is not the province of another to correct it." But if one conference *nullifies* a rule of Discipline, is it not the province of another to *sustain* it? It seems that it is the province of the editor of the Advocate to be out upon those who dare to assert their rights and oppose slavery; though other brethren may openly propose a division of the M. E. Church, and may defend slavery from the Bible, and he is silent! This seems to be the course of our good broth-

er who is set for the defence of the Church!

We agree with Br. Luckey in one thing, however inconsistent it may be with some other parts of his article; viz. that "an appeal may at any time be taken from his [the bishop's] decision on a question of order." But this very thing Bishop Waugh refused to admit at the New England Conference; and of this we complain.

#### NOT THE PLACE—WHY?

The Advocate says, "*This is not the place* to inquire whether a bishop is more likely to guard the Discipline and constitutional principles of the government of the church, than an annual conference." [He has not yet found the *place* to make this inquiry.] It is enough to say that *he* is especially charged with it, [where is he "especially" charged with it?] and is liable, as an annual conference cannot be, for *allowing* any infraction of them." [Where are these "*liabilities*," for *allowing*," &c.] Certainly not in Bishop Emory's statement that a "Bishop has no control whatever over the decisions of either the General or an Annual Conference." And has it come to this, that claims are set up in our official paper for the right and duty of one man to absolutely "control" not the decisions of a General or an Annual Conference *only*, but of *three thousand* ministers of the Gospel, so far at least, as not to "ALLOW" them to do any thing which HE may judge not in accordance with "Methodistical order!" "He, of course," brother L. continues, "must have a right to judge for himself," &c. True; but he has no right to judge for the Conference.

#### ANNUAL CONFERENCES.

If an annual conference does business for the whole church, as the editor contends, then the Baltimore Conference has done business for New England Methodists, in construing away the force of the General Rule on slavery—and yet we must not do business for ourselves on that subject, lest it bring the conferences into collision! Anti-abolition conferences may do business for the whole church, but abolition conferences may not even do business for them-

selves! And this is "Methodistical order!!"

Did the Baltimore Conference do what it did on the subject of our General Rule, by "virtue of its conference rights?" Did the New York Conference require of its candidates for deacons' and elders' orders, a certain "pledge," by virtue of its conference rights? *Who is to be judge* whether "a resolution proposed to be passed in an annual conference be of such a nature that it may as well be passed by the same men in another capacity," or not?—Should not the conference judge for itself in such a case? If conference rights be invaded on the subject of memorials from our people, are not *their* rights invaded also? Does the editor suppose that previous discussion of conference rights will prevent our taking the "regular course" with the bishops, and "presenting their conduct to the regular tribunal for investigation?"

#### DEFENCE OF THE NEW ENGLAND CONFERENCE.

In the 587th No. of the Christian Advocate and Journal, the editor says, he "*does not* tender his services to *vindicate the bishops*." He then pronounces the "address" of Bishop Hedding "clear and perspicuous"—"clear and forcible!" After which he proposes by "fair and impartial" statements to set the "acts" of Bishop Waugh "in their true light." He then states that,

"At the last session of the New England Conference, it appears that there was a *regular party formed among the preachers on this question*. Into this party, no doubt many were drawn without much consideration as to the soundness of the views set forth by those who had agitated the question, or the tendency of the measures in which they were induced to participate.

"These brethren had a meeting before the commencement of the Conference, for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry their views into practical operation in the conference. In the history of their proceedings we have the points at issue between them and the presiding Bishop. Let us examine their doings. Soon after the meeting was organized, the report states,

"The following resolutions were offered by Br. O. Scott:

"*Resolved*, That immediately after the appointment of the regular committee, to-morrow morning, we will peaceably though *firmly*, claim the privilege of presenting our memorials on the subject of slavery, and of referring

them to a select committee; and should this reasonable request be denied us, we shall unitedly and utterly refuse to do any business until we have these our just rights.

"After some discussion, it was voted to lay the resolution on the table.

"Br. Scott presented the following resolution, and it was

*"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to wait on the bishop, and inform him of our wishes, and, if necessary, our determinations.*

*"Such a committee was appointed, who informed the bishop of their request; and also that they had good reason to believe that, if the privilege to introduce their memorials, as requested, were denied, the conference would refuse to act on any subject that should be introduced. They adhered to the principle expressed in the first resolution proposed throughout their proceedings.*

*"In this meeting signers were obtained to a memorial, designed to be presented to the bishop, a committee appointed to fix on some plan of operation to be adopted, in case the bishop should refuse to grant their request, and a vote was taken unitedly to sustain any measures proposed by the committee, and concurred in by the meeting. All this preparation was made to meet the bishop, who had not at that time done an official act as superintendent in that conference."*

#### INCORRECT STATEMENTS.

In the above extracts, there are not less than three incorrect statements.

It is not a *fact* that a "regular party was formed among the preachers on the question" of conference rights. No doubt all the anti-slavery preachers were conference rights men, but no meeting of such men was called, no *party* on *such principles*, or any other, was formed. A meeting simply of the *anti-slavery* preachers was called.

It is not true that the anti-slavery brethren "adhered to the principles expressed in the first resolution throughout their proceedings." If the editor will say that they ought to have done so, I will not dispute with him. The sentiment of this resolution was afterwards expressed in the report of a committee which was adopted, but which was not carried out, in view of the fact, that, before our memorials were presented, two days had been consumed in the anti-slavery discussion by the conference and one of the bishops, so that it was not deemed advisable to consume any more time on the subject during the session of the conference. This, too, was perhaps an error on the part of the abolitionists.

It is not true, that the signers were obtained to a memorial designed to be

presented to the bishop before he had "done one official act" in the conference. These signers were not obtained till the third meeting of the anti-slavery preachers, nor till after two interviews, at least, had been had with the bishop, nor till after he had done many official acts in the conference.

The object of these meetings of the anti-slavery preachers was to prevent, if possible, any collision with the bishop. They were peaceful and friendly, and the bishop so understood them. He gave us no intimation that he thought our course improper! Indeed, he indirectly approved it, by imitating our example, in calling together the principal brethren from among our opponents to counsel with him. And from the brethren who composed the bishop's meeting, a committee of five was appointed to confer with the anti-slavery brethren upon the pending question. So the bishop had his preparatory meetings as well as we; and no intimations were given that the course of either party was improper. A friendly interview took place between the bishop's committee and a committee appointed by us; and there were several friendly interviews between us and the bishop. No one, as far as I know, ever pretended that we were taking a disorderly course, on either side, by these preparatory meetings. But the editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal* now publicly charges a majority of the New England Conference with taking a "disorderly, dangerous, and an exceedingly suspicious" course!

As to "majorities made up in preparatory meetings," brother L. is informed that these "majorities" in the New England Conference had been made up on *principle*, and so far as the slave question is concerned, were made up near three years ago, and before any preparatory meetings were held on the subject. We consider, therefore, that this insinuation is *unjust*, as well as the insinuation, that "many" of the members of the New England Conference "were drawn *without much consideration*," into these "caucus majorities!"

#### DOCTRINE OF RIGHTS.

"It is the doctrine of *rights*," says the editor, "which the desired action of

the conference was to settle." And, to prove this statement, he quotes from our memorial to the bishop, as follows :

"We respectfully ask it as our right as a conference, to appoint a committee to consider and report on said memorials, as also the right to act in a conference capacity, on any report from such committee."

Now why was this "respectful" request made? Because the New England Conference wished to express a sentiment on the moral character of slavery; because 3400 of their members had earnestly requested this at their hands; and because we had been credibly informed that Bishop Waugh would deny us this right. Therefore we respectfully asked it as our right; we did not make this request because we doubted whether we *possessed the right* to oppose, by resolutions, what our Discipline opposes; but to avoid, if possible, open collision on the subject, and to give the bishop full opportunity to reflect before he should publicly take a stand *that he might see cause to regret*; and had he not avowed his determination to *rule the majority* on this subject, the correspondence between him and ourselves would have been kept private. We meant it for good, though the editor of the Christian Advocate and Journal represents it as evil. We asked it as a *right* because we had no disposition to "ask as *favours, rights all our own*." It was conference action, in the form of resolutions, that we wished; and we referred to conference rights no farther than appeared to us necessary to obtain what we and our people desired, namely, the expression of a sentiment against slavery. Had the bishop said in reply, "though I cannot admit your doctrine of rights, yet I shall not object to your having a committee on your memorials, and acting on any report from said committee, with the express understanding, that *I disapprove of the whole proceeding*; and while, as president, I shall not decline putting to the vote business on this subject, yet it must be distinctly understood, that the conference will be held responsible for its own doings, and must answer for it at the proper tribunal." I say, had the bishop taken this course, we should not have disputed him on the subject of "rights," but gone on with our business, and taken the *whole respon-*

*sibility*. And we gave him a fair opportunity to take this course, or a similar one, before he had committed himself, and before we had put in any claim to *rights*, or given him any intimation that we should refuse to do business, if our rights on this subject were denied us. The committee who were appointed by the anti-slavery preachers to confer with the bishop, expressed themselves in writing, and as follows :

"Bishop Waugh,—These brethren and myself have been selected by the anti-slavery brethren, who are preachers, and most of them members of the New England Conference, to inform you that memorials and petitions have been forwarded from the members of our Church, in different parts of the conference, praying the conference to take such action on the subject of slavery as is set forth in the petitions themselves. And the conference, for their brethren and themselves, would request the privilege of introducing them, and having them referred to a select committee, immediately after the appointment of the regular committees to-morrow. They would simply add, that the time for the introduction and reference of these memorials, or petitions, will probably be very short, as the reading of one will be altogether sufficient, inasmuch as they will all be of a similar description."

The above is, word for word, what the committee said to the bishop in their first interview with him. Not a word do we find about "rights"—not a word of threatening—but a simple, mild request in behalf of the conference and thousands of our members!

The bishop wished a little time to *consider*, (!) and intimated that he might "act contrary to our wishes." The next morning the committee met the bishop again, and as they wished him to have a full view of the probable consequences before committing himself, and as he appeared to hesitate, they said to him :

"We think we have good reason to believe, that, if the privilege of introducing these petitions and memorials is denied, the conference will refuse to act on any subject that shall be introduced."

The bishop was not pressed for an immediate answer; neither did he give a decision till two days after this. In the evening of this day, (and after the interview of the bishop's committee with the anti-slavery brethren) a memorial, signed by about seventy members of the conference, (and which was increased before the bishop made his decision, to about NINETY, all members of the con-

ference in full connexion) "respectfully asking it as a right to refer their memorials to a committee," &c., was presented to him. We took every prudential measure that we could think of to prevent the bishop from arraying himself against a majority of the conference on a question of conscience and of rights; but all to no purpose. And now *he* must take the consequences. We commenced a private correspondence, in as mild a way as possible; and had our reasonable request been granted, all would have passed off pleasantly, and without any yielding on either side; for the bishop had not then committed himself, and we had said not a word about "conference rights."

But why, it may be asked, did you call a meeting of the anti-slavery preachers, and appoint a committee to wait on the bishop? Why not wait on him as *individuals*? We answer,—the *cause* was a common one—we all had memorials—and to have taxed the bishop with a private interview with us all, would have been too great an encroachment upon his time. And, besides, we wished him to understand that a large majority of the conference were desiring what we asked, and we believed he would understand this more readily by a peaceable and friendly meeting of the preachers, than by individual representation. But our reasonable claims the bishop considered "*absurd*," "*SUBVERSIVE OF ORDER*," and of "*DESTRUCTIVE TENDENCY*."

#### WHAT RIGHTS WERE CLAIMED?

In claiming the *right* to appoint a committee on the memorials, and to *act* on any report such committee might make, we did not say that it would be our right to *adopt* any report that might be made. The conference might have *acted* on a report in several ways, without adopting it, and might have acted on a report not suitable to be *adopted*. Recommitment, postponement, amendment, or laying on the table, would be acting on the report. If, in the judgment of the conference, the report had been in accordance with the Discipline, then we should have claimed the right to adopt it; but this we could not know, till the report was made. All we asked was the right to *appoint* the committee,

and to *act* on their report. And we further explained to the bishop, that we "did not wish any legislative, judicial, or executive action on slavery;" but simply the right to express an opinion on its moral character.

And now, in view of the whole history of our efforts to express a sentiment on slavery for two or three years past, is it *brotherly*, is it *fair*, for the editor of the Christian Advocate and Journal to affirm, that, at our last conference, this was "altogether a subordinate" object? The question of conference rights was an incidental thing. No opposition on this score was anticipated in our first efforts to oppose slavery in a conference capacity. But since our right, as a conference, to oppose slavery, has been denied, we have felt under the necessity of asserting it, *in order to conference action*.

It is not *true*, that Bishop Waugh "declared" that he "could not *act*" on "*account*" of the doctrine of rights set up in our memorial. He did, indeed, state that he could not *admit* our doctrine of right, but he did not intimate that he "could not *act*" on "*that account*."

Look at the following sentence from the pen of the Rev. S. Luckey:

"Let it be understood, then, that the matter at issue between the parties, or more properly the true grounds of the complaints against the acts of the bishop are, that he declined *presenting to the conference*, for their action, a question which a previously pledged majority were prepared to make on it, would, by fair implication, *divest the general superintendents of the prerogatives* with which they were invested by the General Conference; *and which went to declare, in explicit terms, that annual conferences are independent judicatories, for all the purposes of action upon any question that may be brought before them.*"

The bishop *did not* decline "presenting to the conference for their action," any "question" touching slavery, for the very good reason that he was not asked to present any such question! He declined putting to the vote questions *after they had been presented by other brethren*.

Will the editor tell us how the putting anti-slavery resolutions to the vote, would "divest the general superintendents of their prerogatives?" And will he tell us by what rule of logic he makes out his wonderful conclusion in the last part of the above sentence?



## WHAT IS DESIRABLE.

"We do think it desirable," says the editor, "that subjects which do not tend to affect the immediate labor or administration of the preachers in their several departments of the work, ought to be sparingly introduced into the annual conferences especially, unless there be some great necessity for it." Suppose all this be admitted,—who is to be judge of that "*necessity*," or what *does* "tend to affect the immediate labor or administration of the preachers,"—those who are on the ground, and know their own necessities and wants, or some one else? Shall the senior editor of the Advocate be judge? I suppose him just as capable of judging now, as *he would be if the hands of the episcopacy were laid on his head*. Consecrating him to that office, would not give him one *new* idea, or improve any one which he now possesses. He is as capable of judging now as he would be *then*, and no more capable now than he would be if he were on a circuit or station, in the room of being editor of the Advocate. But I am not willing *he* should be judge for whole conferences. I think it more in accordance with Methodism, that they should be their own judges. Will he say he does not wish to judge, but will be satisfied with carrying out the decisions of the bishops? But I do not know that the bishops, especially the juniors, are more capable of judging what is best for the conferences, than the editor of the Advocate. I presume Br. Luckey would hardly have been willing, as a member of the Genesee Conference, to submit all its concerns, in September, 1835, to the judgment of Rev. B. Waugh, the *book agent*; but how much better the Rev. B. Waugh, the *bishop*, was qualified to take this responsibility upon himself, in September, 1836, I leave for others to judge.

"There is a vast difference," says the Advocate, "between saying they would admit of no action on the question, and that they could not admit the *right* of the conference to have action on *any* report which a committee might present respecting it. For this last only the presiding bishop [Waugh] at that [the N. E.] Conference made himself accountable." Is this representation correct? Bishop Waugh did deny to the

last N. E. Conference the *right* to have any action on the subject of slavery, except to prepare a simple memorial to the General Conference of 1840, and even that *they must not publish!* And he would only put a motion for a committee, with that understanding. How strange that a Methodist bishop, in 1837, should require an annual conference to *AGREE what a committee on a moral subject shall say*, BEFORE a motion can be put to appoint such a committee! And yet stranger still, that the editor of our official paper should *defend such a course*; and then attempt to make it appear that this *same bishop* only denied the conference the right to *act* on any report the committee might make! And that, too, with the bishop's document before him, which clearly teaches a different doctrine!

## STRANGE ASSERTIONS.

But look at another of the strange assertions of the Advocate. "The general superintendents are *set to guard* the bond of union among all the annual conferences, and are *held* as the constituted guardians of it by the General Conference." Where does the editor find that provision? Such a provision, if it could be found, would imply that an annual conference of Methodist preachers, many of whom may be older than the bishop, are a mere company of boys, who must have one "*set to guard*" their *actions*, lest they go astray! and one of their own number, peradventure, would be abundantly able to do it, providing he first be made a *bishop*, though now he may be incapable of taking care of himself! What the Advocate claims for the bishops, I would say, with the editor of the Maine Wesleyan Journal, belongs to the conferences. They are the guardians of our doctrines, institutions, &c., and their acts pass in review before the General Conference once in four years. If the annual conferences are unfaithful to their trust, it is for the General Conference, *not the bishops*, to correct them.

The Advocate says again, "It is, then, *principally* for their transactions and decisions *in* the annual conferences, that the bishops are held responsible, as general superintendents, to the General Conference." Here, again, is a naked

assertion, without the shadow of proof! Where does the editor find such a provision? All the Discipline says about their conduct in the conferences is that they are to "preside" in them.

They have never been called to answer for any thing done by an annual conference. Inasmuch, therefore, as the conferences are alone responsible for their own acts, it is unreasonable and inconsistent to pretend that the president has a right to *dictate* what *shall*, and what *shall not* be done.

But the Advocate first loads down the bishops with responsibilities, which the Discipline never laid upon them, and then, upon these *imaginary responsibilities*, founds its claims for commensurate powers,—powers never claimed till within a short time. The premises of the Advocate are *false*, with respect to *responsibilities*, and therefore its conclusions are *unjust*.

Look at the following singular sentence from this paper:

"No power or right is claimed for the bishops, more than is given to other public officers in a well regulated system of civil or ecclesiastical polity, namely, just enough to carry into effect the work they are appointed to do."

But what is the work which they are appointed to do? The Discipline is explicit upon this point. And so far as their work in the conferences is concerned, all they are appointed to do is to "*preside*" in them. Their duty, therefore, is nothing more nor less, in the conferences, than that of the chairman or president of any deliberative body.

#### CASES OF CONSCIENCE.

Now let us see how the Advocate stumbles in cases of conscience:

"To say that men are bound in conscience to express an opinion in a conference capacity, on any particular question, which they have not solemnly engaged so to express, in their contract of union with that body, is to pervert the meaning of the term, and neutralize its moral force."

But are not all Methodist ministers, even in conference assembled, bound in conscience to do all the good they can? Now, if an annual conference solemnly believes that it can exert an influence against a great moral evil in a *conference capacity*, that it cannot exert in any other way, is it not conscientiously bound to do so? No matter

whether it has *agreed* to do this or not. The conference may err in judgment, but still their duty is the same, so long as this is their solemn conviction. And they cannot feel that it is safe to commit this case of conscience, either to the *bishop*, or the editor of the Advocate. And the opposition which our opponents make to the conference action, shows that, in their opinion, there would be an influence connected with *such* action, that would not be connected with action in another capacity. The right to express an opinion on a moral question we have never ceded away, and therefore it remains: it is a right which is common to all *times*, and to all *places*; *whenever* and *wherever* a majority choose to exercise it, they may properly do so. *General, annual, and quarterly conferences have this right in common*. It is a right which exists among Christians and Christian ministers, in the very nature of things. The bishop has no right to interfere in the two former cases, so as to prevent action, nor the presiding elder in the latter. It is for these bodies to say whether they will oppose this or that evil in *their conference capacity or otherwise*. And it will hereafter be considered among the wonders of the world, that this right should ever have been disputed.

Before we were admitted to the office of elders, we were obliged to promise that we would "be ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word." And now to pretend that we have no right, as Methodist preachers, to do this in conference capacity, without the consent of the *bishops*, is monstrous, not to say ridiculous!

As to the editor's supposed *possible* case of "a conference of ninety-nine members," or "fifty to fifty—one to one," "reckoning the bishop," it only shows how hard he is pressed for arguments, and especially for *authorities* to sustain his positions. And what he says about the impropriety of the young men having a voice in these important conference matters, *they will doubtless know how to appreciate!* By the way, if our opponents have all the *talents*, the right side of the question, and the bishops' influence besides, it is rather singular

that they should be so much afraid that the *majority* will be against them?

REV. G. F. COX.

The abstract question of conference rights has been most ably argued by Rev. G. F. Cox, in several numbers of the *Maine Wesleyan Journal*. As Br. Cox has never been known as an abolitionist, his views on conference rights will, perhaps, have the more weight with some. His arguments, however, do not depend upon any circumstance for their weight and conclusiveness. They commend themselves to every man's understanding and conscience in the sight of God. They are such as no sophistry can undermine or destroy.

The following extracts are from four different numbers of the *Journal*. The last, entitled "Laws of the Presidency," is inserted *entire*; and it contains not only *arguments*, but *USAGE* and *FACTS*. The *Christian Advocate* has published two or three of Br. Cox's articles, with remarks; but it has not published this, neither will it *dare* to give it to its readers. It is not so long an article as one or two others which the *Advocate* has copied from the *Journal*; but Br. Luckey finds, I presume, that "facts are stubborn things;" and thus ends as easily as possible a controversy which he doubtless felt unable successfully to prosecute farther; though, in the opinion of many, the rules of any honorable discussion required the *Advocate* to publish the "Laws of the Presidency."

"The General Conference we regard as the primary body, and the one to which ALL the clergy are ultimately amenable. The bishop we regard as an *executive officer*, having limited trusts with regard to himself, but over no others, excepting in their individual character, and excepting also the *appointment* of the preachers and general oversight of their character. But he has no *control* over an annual conference. His duty in that body is limited to *order*, and the will of the Conference—and perhaps also cases of law, *when submitted to him*. But it may be asked, what if the Conference refuse to go forward in the regular business of its session? We answer, the Conference in such a case is *not* responsible to the *bishop*, but to the *GENERAL CONFERENCE*, where *all* its business is regularly examined at every session of that body. If the annual conferences leave their proper work, it is the bishop's duty to admonish them; but if they persist in their course, he is under obligation to put to vote any question that the Conference may require of him; but in such cases—and indeed in every other—the bishop is not and cannot be responsible for

the acts of the annual conferences. Indeed, was it ever heard, that a bishop was called in question for the doings of annual conferences! These bodies pass in review before their proper tribunal *once in four years*; but the bishops were never yet criminated for an *act* of the annual conferences. And it is somewhat surprising that it should ever have been so regarded; and it probably never would have been but from the apprehensions of danger which our worthy superintendents have indulged in on the slave question.

"Again, we place the question on the ground that, if the bishop is an executive organ of the General Conference, the annual conferences are *such more so*. Indeed, the annual conferences are the proper *judicial* or judging and executive organ of the General Conference during its *interim*. Perhaps we might say justly, that the annual conferences are the General Conference, with surrendered trusts, which they take back again at the session of that primary body, by their representatives. That is, all the annual conferences, in their representatives, *become* a General Conference once in four years, again invested with their surrendered rights. To say, therefore, that our *presidents* are the only organs of the General Conference, during the interim of that body, is to assume what is not contemplated in the economy of Methodism; and what we believe has been contended for by no ecclesiastical body whatever."—[*Maine Wesleyan Journal*, Nov. 25, 1837.]

"The views that we laid down in a previous number, have assumed to us a new importance, after reading the remarks of the *Advocate*. It will be recollected, that we advanced the opinion, that the annual conferences were *JUDGES* of their *own* acts and duties *during the interim of the General Conference*; and that, in case of default or error, they were amenable to that body, in their *associated capacity*, and *to no other*. The *Advocate* assumes a different doctrine—one that, in our estimation, is at war with the general policy of our Church, and chartered rights. The editor of that paper thus lays down the general principles of Conference action. His remarks are—'That there are some things which it is the *duty* of the conferences to do; some things they *may* do; others they *may not* do; and yet others that they *ought not* to do.' And of the whole of these he speaks thus:—

"In either doing a thing, or preventing it being done, both the president and the members may have a part. The president in *presenting* it, or *putting* the question, the Conference in acting on it. Or in case of preventing it, the president in *declining* to put it, and the Conference in *declining* to act. And in so far as either is responsible for the thing being or not being done, in so far this right must be possessed by the party thus responsible.

"In the decision of the Conference, after the question is presented to them for their action, the president has no part, and is therefore in no wise accountable for it. And as it is the duty of the president to put all questions which ought to be acted on, if he declines doing so in any case, at that point all responsibility on the part of the Conference ceases."

"From what we can glean from the whole

article—which may be found upon our first page—we believe he maintains that the ‘balance of power,’ or ‘balance check,’ lies in this: If the bishop present business for action, the conference may *decline acting*: If the conference present business for action, the bishop may decline acting, and therefore overrule it—in which case the conference *cannot act upon it*. And that the bishop has the sole right of presenting the *regular* business. This is the principle laid down, at least in those cases where the bishop and conference do not think alike. If this be the doctrine avowed by the editor, we differ from him very materially.—And he will allow us to present to him the following reasons for this difference.

“Before however proceeding to state our objections to his construction of Discipline, we wish to state more definitely the question at issue between us. Let it then be understood, that the question is not, what may properly be the duties of the bishop when in conference, (for when without they have nothing to do with him) when both parties may be agreed: nor what may be the duties of the annual conference under the same circumstances. But the true and only question at issue between us will be, Who is to be judge when they disagree? And the question is not, Who is to be the *ultimate* judge: For it will be conceded on all hands, that the ultimate judge is the General Conference. The question is, Who is to be judge during the interim of that body, or while it is not in session? Who is to be judge, for instance, of the question, what are the duties of an annual conference? We know that their duties, many of them, are laid down in the Discipline, so plain that one would think a mistake could not occur. But who is to judge of Discipline, and those cases where the duties are *inferred* from the nature of the organization, and by implication from the Discipline? And especially, Who is to decide when the conference disagree with the bishop—disagree upon what is the will of the General Conference—what are the duties assigned the annual conferences?

“Now we answer, it must be, either the bishop or the conference. And there must be a general *law*, one that will apply in all cases where they differ. Either the bishop has the controlling voice or the conference has. For it will be understood that they may differ at every turn. Scarcely a conference could occur, without having many questions of this character come up. Now we take the ground that in *all cases*, where conference action is *needed*—and the conference must be judge of this till the ensuing General Conference—the conference is the sole judge, and always has the controlling voice.

“In offering our reasons for this opinion, we naturally inquire, which opinion most accords with the design and genius of Methodism?—with its general usage?—with the writings of those who have arisen for the defence of our Episcopacy?—and with the obvious meaning of the language conveying the chartered rights in the Discipline?

“But lest we might seem over-confident, we concede that the Discipline, and usage, in a very limited extent, are capable of *two constructions*;—one of which favors the authority and controlling influence of the bishop—and

the other would give the control to the annual conferences. But we give our voice for the annual conferences; and assign as reasons for our opinion,—

“1. The opposite doctrine gives the superintendent the entire *control* over *every thing* that an annual conference may have to do with. We except nothing. We must at least provide for frailty in man, in every organization to be controlled by him. This is usually done. We will therefore suppose the superintendent *disposed* to do *wrong*, and withhold from the conference its *proper* business—and disposed also to decline acting upon *every thing* suggested by the conference. What would be the result, if the doctrine were true that the bishop was to decide? and had the power, as the Advocate states, of withholding the *proper* business of the conference? and also of *declining* to act on business *presented by the conference*? No man could be examined—no man ordained—no fiscal concerns transacted—nor a single act of conference performed, whether it related to the cause of missions—to the supernuated preachers—widows and orphans—or the trial of a preacher who was suffering unjustly from the cruel aspersions of the world. The above doctrine would put in the hands of the Episcopacy the moral character of all the clergy, in all the conferences in the United States; because, if *displeased* at any one, as above intimated, the bishop can, at any annual conference, *refuse* his case a hearing—and refuse putting the question of an appeal to the General Conference, and there is no redress. So that he would be entirely cutoff from the privileges guaranteed to him by the General Conference.

“2. Moreover, it puts into the hands of the superintendents, did they agree upon the measure, the power of dissolving the whole organized body of the Methodist Episcopal Church. By refusing or *declining* to act on the elections for delegates to the General Conference—a power, according to the Advocate, which they have—they could prevent a General Conference; and by declining to either *present* or *receive* business, they could prevent from acting *all* the Annual Conferences. So that, by a single concert, the whole body could be checked at once, if not destroyed. Now we believe it *impossible*, either to fairly construe our Discipline thus, or make our clergy receive such doctrine, either east, west, north or south.

“3. We will add, as another reason, that our Discipline does not contemplate, in *every exigency*, that a Bishop is *essential* to the regular business of an Annual Conference. It provides, that if the Bishop is not present at the Annual Conference, he may by letter appoint the Presiding Elder to preside in his stead.—But if this is not done,—by refusal or otherwise,—the Conference may elect its own president for the time being. We say therefore, here is one exigency, when the Annual Conference is permitted to provide its own president. We will not say that it has the right—but we may ask, could they not do this in case the Bishop should be *present*, but should *refuse* to act on *all cases*, and refuse also to provide any substitute. We think they might. And we believe this is the spirit of our constitution.

“4. We base our fourth reason upon a cir-

cumstance peculiar to Methodism. It has been the glory of Methodism that her Episcopacy differed in some degree from that of the English and Roman churches. The difference contended for by our writers, is, that our Bishops have less power—and that the term Bishop and Episcopacy is applied by us to designate an office rather than one or more individuals possessing an inherent power above the rest of the clergy.\* They have contended that our Bishops have no control whatever, from Episcopacy, over an Annual Conference. In a word, that all essential to that office is delegated by the hands of the presbyters.—Now, although we do not agree in every respect with the mode of reasoning usually adopted by us in this matter, yet we do believe that whatever the Bishops have, peculiar to their office, is delegated to them by the General Conference. And according to RAWLE and others, on constitutional law, modes of determining the meaning of covenants, agreements of social bodies, &c., whatever is not delegated, and cannot be deduced from the words of the delegated trust, is reserved to the controlling body.

"If, then, this control over the Annual Conferences,—this power to withhold business, if the Bishop become perverse or disagree with the Conference—and to decline acting on any business presented by the Annual Conference, exist; the fact must be found in our Discipline; else it is not theirs. Let it rest where it will, it does not rest with the Bishops, unless so stated. What then are the facts in the case? Our Discipline limits the duty of the Bishops to the following cases, which are apparently divided into three parts: first, his duty in the Annual Conference—his duty during the interval of that body—and his general duty, or that which requires him to superintend the connexion at large. His duty in the Annual Conferences is thus set down:

"1. He is to *preside*. And for the meaning of the term we have no guide but analogy.

"2. To fix the appointments of Preachers.

"3. In the interval of the Annual Conferences, when these bodies are not in session, he has power to change, receive, and suspend preachers.

"The above we believe is all that is expressly stated in our Discipline, as falling under the control of a Bishop in an Annual Conference—and during the interim of that body: excepting perhaps the appointment of a committee.

"His general duties are thus spoken of:

"1. He is to *travel* through the connexion at large.

"2. To oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church.

"3. To ordain bishops, elders, and deacons.

"Now we confess ourselves unable to perceive, either in express words, or in principles that can be fairly deduced from the text, any power like that contended for by the Advocate. And until it is deduced, we need not attempt a

\* A Bishop of the English Church, in this country, has only a voting power in their conventions. But in this case, both convention and Bishop may speak—and speak publicly. But if the Advocate be true, our Bishops may crush a proposition without action. This the other Bishop does not pretend to. But we believe our writers, Emory, Bangs, and others, have invariably contended that our Bishops have no control over an Annual Conference.

defence. No common mind, we suspect, will be able to discover it, if it exists; but that fact alone would furnish prima facie evidence against the doctrine."

[*Maine Wesleyan Journal*, Dec. 3, 1837.]

#### CONFERENCE RIGHTS.

"We advert again to the subject of conference rights. We think we are moved to this solely from a wish that truth may appear. We are aware that it is a subject that must ultimately be decided by the highest tribunal of our Church. And the question may be asked, and has been asked, Why present it to the people? To this, and similar inquiries, we have but one answer to make. The question, we think, must be discussed. And although the question might find an abler advocate, it probably would not find one less pledged to sustain a particular side. We think, too, permanent union can only be enjoyed among an enlightened people, by a full understanding of the principles upon which that union is based, whether that union relate to the people or the clergy, or both. On this subject we sometimes commit a great error: We are afraid to present to the people principles, lest they should draw wrong conclusions from them. We incline to the opinion that every rule and principle of our church government should be known to the people—yes, to the whole nation. And what would be the result? Why, if every man in the nation understood Methodism—the whole of it—she could only be misrepresented by perverse minds; and these would have one to rebuke them at every corner of the street. Let every denomination of Christians fully understand our policy, as they would, by free discussion; and every good man would either approve of it, or, in case of disapproval, would see all its excellencies. And it seems to us that this should be the general policy of the parent paper. They should let the whole body know all that is passing of moment in every section. Nothing of this character can be uninteresting to the whole body. If a small number suffers, the whole body feels. Moreover, in case of dispute, should the question be generally settled, it will not so soon revive. We would, therefore, have our whole system held up to the light of the sun. Were this done in reference to our whole policy, we should anticipate such a permanency to our institutions, as intelligence and God only could give. But on the other hand, if not discussed, and the principles of our union remain unknown—we may be misrepresented, as we have been, at every corner of the street—a principal reason for which, would be that our policy is not known. It has not been thus with our doctrines. These have been known—discussed. And of the result of this free, this unrestrained inquiry, we need not speak. But to the question:

"In presenting our views upon the question of conference rights, we will, in the first place, lay down a few general principles. We shall then make some remarks upon the article from the Advocate.

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

"1. Conventional bodies have restricted powers. Their rights may be divided into two

*classes*, those of an *associate*, and those enjoyed by individuals in the execution of their duties as members, while separate from the associate body.

"2. The office of a bishop is restricted. A bishop has no *right* to transcend the duties assigned him in the Church charter by the General Conference; yet during the interim of that body, he must be *judge* of what those duties are. A presiding elder has no *right* to transcend the duties assigned him in the Discipline; yet during the absence of the bishop and in the interim of the Annual Conference, he must be *judge* of what those duties are. A preacher has no *right* to transcend the duties assigned him in the Discipline; yet during the absence of the presiding elder, and in the interim of the Conference, he must be *judge* of what those duties are.

#### ASSOCIATED RIGHTS.

"3. The General Conference is a restricted body. The General Conference has no *right* to transcend the limits or duties assigned it in the charter or Discipline of the Church; yet until otherwise ordered by the united voice of all the Annual Conferences, it must be *judge* of what those duties are.

"The Annual Conferences have no *right* to transcend the duties assigned them by the General Conference; yet during the interim of that body, they must be judges of what those duties are.

"The Quarterly Conferences are restricted bodies. They have no *right* to transcend the duties assigned them in the Discipline of the Church; yet during the interim of the Annual Conference, they must be judges of what those duties are.

"4. All these officers, and the associated bodies, have no *right*, yet all have *power* to *err*, and all *may do wrong*. But in either of these cases, the error can only be corrected before the respective tribunals to which they are accountable. The Quarterly Conference is accountable, not to the preacher; not to the presiding elder—but to the Annual Conference. The Annual Conference, not to the presiding elder; not to the bishops—but to the General Conference. These principles, we believe, hold good in all appeals. In such cases, it would be an anomaly in the Discipline of our Church, to refer the conduct of a quarterly meeting to the decision of a bishop, unless by request of Conference. Our Discipline does not thus speak—but the decision is to be made by the 'Conference.' But if the bishop were ultimate judge of *law*, or in any case, where associate bodies act, it would have been referred to *him* by the Discipline, and not by the Conference.

"Preachers, presiding elders, and bishops, may give their construction of law, and so may every other man in the Conference; but, after all, 'the Conference' must decide; and their decision is final, unless overruled by the higher *associate body*. At least, thus we understand the Discipline of our Church. We do not say, that these associate bodies are to judge *what* business they are to do, and *when* they are to do it; limiting the word *when*, to the time *when* they are to sit. And as to *what* business they are to do, this is not left to them to decide; but

they are to *judge* what the *highest body*, or the *Discipline*, has assigned to them. And no one may wrest this judgment from them. When the power to judge is taken from them, all responsibility must cease.

"5. The *putting of questions* to vote, by the president, in associated bodies, is not an individual, but an associate act. The recording the doings of an associate body, is not an individual, but an associate act. Who would contend, that the putting of a question by a chairman, or president, either in a committee, in a temperance society, in the House of Representatives, or Senate, was an individual, and not an associate act.

"6. The duties of a president are not changed by the manner of his appointment—whether he is entitled to the presidency from the nature of his office, or is elected by the body, he is still president, and is under the laws that control that office; unless the contrary were particularly specified by the body which conveyed to him his trust.

"7. The presidents of conferences, *as such*, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, have no control over the *decisions* of these bodies, whether we speak of the Quarterly, Annual, or General Conference.

"This law, we believe, holds good in Methodism universally. The *committee*, in case of the trial of a member, *not the preacher, decide*; the Quarterly Conferences, not their presidents, decide; the General Conference, not its president, *decides*. And this in all cases, unless by mutual consent it should be referred to the presiding officer.

"Bishop Emory has justly remarked, in the defence of our Fathers, that 'the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have no control *whatever* over the decisions of either the General or Annual conferences.'

"There may be private reasons for giving this remark of Bishop Emory a different interpretation from what the text naturally indicates, and if they are presented we will notice them. But as the text stands, we know of no way to avoid the conclusion. The bishops of the English Church, he remarks in connection with the above paragraph, have a *vetoing* power over their conventions. Our bishops, he certainly has said, have not this power. Moreover, they have no control *whatever* over the *decisions* either of Annual or General Conferences. They cannot *prevent* a decision—which would be a *greater* than a vetoing power—they cannot rule a decision, as this would equal it—they cannot veto it, when made, as expressly stated in the connecting paragraph. They have no control, therefore, over their decisions whatever. It cannot be said that he intended to say, that they had no control *after* a decision had been made; this would have been vetoing power. And besides, he would hardly have found it necessary to have said, that a bishop had not power to contravene a *law* of the General Conference. Probably this will not be contended for. And it is worthy of remark, that he has given the *president, as such, precisely the same relation to the Annual, that he has to the General Conference*. There is another reason for this: If the bishop cannot rule a decision in the General Conference, then it follows that he is subordinate to that body;

and therefore the *lesser* judge. But the decision of the *lesser* judge cannot be *final* in the Annual Conference. If final, they have no higher appeal—no higher tribunal. But this cannot be pretended, as they would then be amenable, not to the General Conference, as the Discipline makes them—but to the *bishop*. A doctrine, which we presume none will contend for.

"But while we thus give control to the conferences, it may be asked, 'What shall be done with the *conscience* of the president, when the Conference judge erroneously in *his estimation*?' Perhaps we might here ask, what shall be done with the *consciences* of the other members of the Conference, if he errs in *their estimation*? The question is as broad as it is long, only with this difference—if the control is with the president, he may bind a *hundred consciences*; if with the Conference, but *one* is bound. But the knot, we think, may be *untied*. What shall be done with the conscience of the *secretary*? What with the conscience of any *minority*? To these questions, we reply, the minority cannot *coerce* the majority if they would, and they should not if they could. But a broad path is open to them—one that has been too long trodden to be unknown. If the minority believe the movement revolutionary, or treasonable, they should protest against it, and utter their voice to the world, or leave their seats—and wait the decision of the highest tribunal, to justify or condemn them. Examples are not wanting, in such instances. But, if it be an error of judgment merely, it would seem at least courteous for the minority to conclude that they *erred*.

"Again—The act of merely 'putting a question,' unless of a treasonable character, cannot involve the bishop in the guilt or innocence of the decision of the Conference. The act of putting the question, is a *conference act*, and one which it is made his duty to do, by the General Conference, in making him the *president* of the Annual Conference—duties, which are undefined other than in the word *PRESIDE*, the meaning of which is known to all the world. And in making it his duty to *preside*—using that term in its common acceptation—they, the General Conference, have exculpated him for the acts of the Annual Conference.

"But when a movement should be revolutionary, and cannot be stopped, the president should wipe his hands from the sin, and leave them. We do not mean for an hour, that they may go into 'committee of the whole;' as such a proceeding we believe outstretching the limits altogether of these annual bodies. What cannot be done in an annual conference, regularly organized, cannot be legally done at all. When they change their character, and become *another* body, and for which they were never constituted, their acts can have *no validity*. We think, therefore, when a president cannot, from a conviction of its revolutionary tendency, put a question, he should warn the body, and let the Conference bear the entire responsibility. If it were a question of *judgment* merely, perhaps he might conclude, in common with frail man, that he might be in error; and then yield to the majority. But in case of revolutionary movements, there is always a point, where obligations to the powers that be, ceases. There have been cases, when it was right for civil

authorities to *rebel*, and ecclesiastical bodies to *protest*. The rule is good on both sides, and is perhaps one of the safety valves of the world. But such occasions should be fearfully solemn and weighty. Yet no man may be bound to infringe upon his duty to God, to obey his fellow, one or more.

"But it appeals to us, if allowed to argue from such considerations, that the danger is much less, and the permanency of the Church much greater, in lodging the judging power with the *associate* bodies, than it could be in the hands of a few. If the power to rule decisions be with the *bishop*, or he has power to be the *sole judge* of what is *proper*, and what is *improper* business, and *prevent* the introduction of what he esteems improper, it is probably a *general law*. Now, there are in the Church over a hundred presiding elders, who meet *associate* bodies,—quarterly conferences, four times a year. These occupy to the lesser bodies, the place of the bishop. And these will doubtless, if so decided, assume the power to judge what is 'proper business,' and then introduce resolutions, on all the movements of the day. Indeed, this *has* been done already in a few instances, in reference to subjects that a majority of some of the quarterly conferences thought not proper. Three thousand preachers, too, occupy the place of presiding elders; and in their leaders' meetings, may follow the same steps. Now, in as much as safety exists in *associate bodies*—they being less liable to caprice—more than in one or more men, when not in council, the wisdom of our Church is seen, in placing this power where it *has*, IN THE ASSOCIATE BODIES. In this place, whether leaders' meeting, quarterly conference, annual conference, or the general conference, you have the united wisdom of the preacher, the presiding elder, the bishop, as the case may be, as well as the council of the members who compose the *associate body*—and among which, we may safely say, is found age, experience, deep-toned piety, and in many instances, learning of no ordinary character."

[Maine Wesleyan Journal, Dec. 30, 1837.]

#### LAWS OF PRESIDENCY.

"We suppose the law which pertains to the office of a president of an associate body, must be learned either,—

"1. From the constitution or by-laws of the body over which he presides; or,

"2. From the laws which are usual in such bodies; or,

"3. When applied to a president of an annual conference, to established custom, or precedent; or,

"4. They may be argued in some degree, where other evidence is wanting, from the tendency of the particular powers that may be claimed.

"From either, or all of the above sources of information, so far as they bear upon the president of an annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it will probably be seen that the power of such an officer is limited—

"1. To the preservation of order.

"2. He is to be the *organ* of the associate body over which he presides, through which they may express their views, decisions, or doings. He does this by putting questions, and

declaring votes; and at all times being the organ through which they speak. They have, as an associate body, no other organ through which to speak,—no other head; and if this be cut off, or refuse to act, the body is *dead* for the time being. Appeals are often made to him from the body, for the purpose, not of getting his individual will or decision upon a question, but as a ready way of obtaining the decision of the body. And hence, if not in accordance with the will of that body, the body is again appealed to from his decision. Yet his decisions are usually taken as valid.

"It is laid down as law, upon this subject, by writers who have bestowed attention to it, that the moment a question is moved, and obtains a second, it is before the body, and *in their possession*; and this, too, *before* the question is put. It is also stated, that a subject is *no more* in possession of a body, *after* the question is put, than *before*. Hence it will be seen, that 'the putting of all questions' is an act of the body, or an associate act, through its proper organ.\* And it is stated, by the same authority, that *not* to put a question thus before an associate body, is a breach of order. A president is therefore *in this sense*, subject to the will or control of the body over which he presides; and, we will add only in this sense. Individual responsibility, if he discharge his duty as president, rests upon him only as he approves or disapproves, or gives a casting vote. But he is *never*, without the sanction of the body,—in other words, unless submitted to him—finally to *RULE A QUESTION OF LAW*.

"The annual conferences have, from the beginning, been clothed with *judiciary* or *JUDGING* power, subject to no other appeal than to the General Conference. Every annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church has upon its own records, where they have been in existence even but a few years, *hundreds* of acts of this character. And we believe, till within the last two years,—not *five* and we know not of one,—can be cited to the contrary. We are aware that it is frequently a custom to ask the decision of the chair; but this is only in accordance with the common custom of all associated bodies; and generally this is final, because supposed by the body correct. But no decision of that kind would be valid in a conference, unless it were by vote or assent, sanctioned by the conference, and placed upon record, as the opinion of the body. This was the course pursued by Bishop Emory, in some ten cases cited below, in the Maine Conference. After he had given his decision, it was sanctioned by vote, and thus stands recorded on the journals. And may we not here ask, to whom else are appeals made, in our whole economy, by the Discipline, but to the *associate bodies*,—not for evidence, but *LAW*. Did ever a man hear, in the transaction of business in an annual conference, of an appeal from a quarterly conference, or any where else, to the *bishop*, for his decision? We venture to say, No. How many times have the *conferences* given their construction of Discipline,—its thirty rules, and others pertaining to government, trials, etc.? Who can tell? And all this is right; and their decision is only to be overruled by the General Conference.

"But it is said, 'In case of the trial of an accused member, the *preacher* before whom he is brought sits as a judge, and is therefore the expounder of the law under which the delinquent is brought to trial; and from his decision there is no appeal to the committee, as to the meaning of the law, though they may decide on its applicability to that particular case, as well as of the evidence adduced in support of the alleged offence; but the appeal, should the committee dissent from the preacher in respect to the law or rule, is to the presiding elder; and if the preacher dissent from him, he may carry his appeal to the annual conference, who have a right to decide on a question involving the character and administration of their members.'

"We only need reply to such remarks,—

"1. That, although in the *individual* exercise of clerical authority, during the interval of the associate bodies, the deacon, in the administration of discipline, is to yield his judgment to the elder, and the elder to the presiding elder, and the presiding elder to the bishop; yet all are subject in *judgment* to the control of the ASSOCIATE BODIES. A bishop cannot take the judgment even from a quarterly meeting conference, much less from an annual or general conference. The associate bodies, in the Methodist Church, *RULE* in final decisions: to them, from the lowest committee up to the quarterly meeting, annual and general conferences, appeals are made for the decision of *ALL QUESTIONS WHATEVER* involved in the Book of Discipline. And there is not one letter in the Discipline, we believe, properly understood, nor in the practices of the conferences for thirty-eight years, that teaches a contrary doctrine; but all, it seems to us, sanction '.

"2. That where a case is submitted to a *committee*, our Discipline says, 'But if one of the parties be dissatisfied with the *JUDGMENT*'—not verdict merely—'given, such party may apply to the ensuing *QUARTERLY MEETING CONFERENCE*,' but *not* to the *presiding elder*, as above stated.

"The Discipline says again, 'If the minister or preacher differ in *JUDGMENT* from a majority of the society or select number, concerning the innocence or guilt of the accused person, the trial, in such a case, may be referred to the ensuing *quarterly meeting conference*,' [not the presiding elder].

"The Discipline says again, 'If a murmur or complaint from any excluded person, in any of the above instances, that justice has not been done, he shall be allowed an appeal to the next quarterly meeting conference,' [not the presiding elder.]

"3. But we reply, thirdly,—and which, we trust, will settle the question,—the decision of the *GENERAL CONFERENCE* of 1804, places it beyond a doubt. It was there said, '*QUARTERLY CONFERENCES* are clothed with *judiciary* power; presiding elders, as chairmen, preserve order, and settle questions of order, but *not* of *LAW*, apart from the court over which they preside.' [See an account of the session of that conference, by a member of the venerable body, in the Western Christian Advocate of 1836.] And this decision, it will be borne in mind, was made when the rules of our church were made, and that, too, after a long discussion upon this very point.

"And we say, this should settle the general

\* See Jefferson's Manual.



question; because the presiding elders have all the powers of the bishop given to them in the district over which they preside. And their trust is delegated to them in the same phraseology as that which conveys the trust to the episcopacy. The language of the Discipline is, in reference to the bishops,—‘they shall preside in our conferences; shall change, receive, and suspend preachers; shall travel through the connexion at large; shall oversee the *spiritual and temporal* business of the church.’ The trust is conveyed to the *presiding elder* in the following words: ‘To travel through his appointed district; to take charge of all the elders, deacons, travelling and local preachers, and exhorters in his district; to change, receive, and suspend preachers during the intervals of the conferences, and in the absence of the bishop; to preside in the conferences, in the absence of the bishop; to *oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church in his district*; to take care that every part of Discipline be enforced in his district.’ We say it *settles the question*, because the General Conference of 1804 has, by its decision, determined the fact, first, that *judiciary power* belongs to the quarterly meeting conferences; and, secondly, that the terms ‘oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the church,’ do not mean that they have power to settle ‘questions of law, apart from the court over which they preside.’ And with these sentiments agrees our practice. One case occurs to us, which we ought not to withhold. It was at the Maine Conference of 1835. Bishop Emory was in the chair. Some ten or twenty questions of *law* came up, from the quarterly conference, from Industry circuit, for decision. Bishop Emory *proposed them to the conference for their decision*. But to hasten business, the writer of this article, if he recollects rightly, rose and moved that the question be submitted to the chair. It was done; and the decisions of Bishop Emory were given. But his opinions all received the sanction of the conference by vote, and are thus recorded on the journals of the conference, as the opinion, not of the bishop, but of the conference. Moreover, we find more than *twenty decisions* of a judiciary character, at that single session, by the conference, besides the examination of character. And we venture to say, that there is not an annual conference in the United States, whose journals will not show, that from the beginning they have acted as *judiciary* bodies upon all questions of law. And we confess ourselves utterly surprised that any different view can be entertained, by persons who have attended these bodies for any length of time. Indeed, we think when the *judging power* is taken from the conferences, *they are so much less than a cipher*, that they need never be used.

“But, in conclusion, it may be asked,—Has not a president of an annual conference any other power, over that body, than that which pertains to the office of a president? We answer cheerfully, he has. He has the power of appointments. But this control does not arise from his office as president. He may also limit the session of that body to a week. But neither does this control arise from the nature of that office, but from his episcopal character. The bishop has also over the conference a degree of pastoral authority. But pastoral power he has every where. But it may be

conceded, that when the bishop commands order in a conference, that the command is clothed with more authority than it would be from a mere chairman of an associate body. This would arise from his religious character. His counsels, too, would partake of the same characteristics. But this power does not, cannot, defeat the ends of private and official judgment upon duties that belong to conference, unless the bishop be the *sole head of the church*,—a position which we hope no man will defend. This would be assuming an authority never claimed, to our knowledge, in an associate body. And it may not be improper to remark, that such power is *not* conceded to the highest officer in the Church of Rome. The decision of the pope is not considered binding, if contrary to the council.\* We may remark, also, that pastoral power in conference only extends to order, and what may be claimed from religious character, but not the power over the judgment. The bishop may *rule* the conference by *love*, and the wisdom and weight of his counsels; but obligation to obey in conference applies to the duties of religion, rather than to opinions on official judgments, as these are all settled, in Methodism, in associate bodies; and it must be thus, so long as the right of private judgment is allowed. When this is taken away, we need not tell what follows.

[Maine Wesleyan Journal, Jan., 1838.]

### REV. T. MERITT.

The following is an extract from a letter by Rev. T. Meritt, to an aged member of the N. E. Conference:

“What you say of petitioning ‘the General Conference to define the rights of the annual conferences,’ is not quite so clear to my understanding. Indeed, if you were to propose the petitioning of the General Conference to permit the annual conferences to institute or to do away some *rite* (not *right*) or ceremony, I might join in it without hesitancy. But if the question relates to a subject of a moral nature, I dare not ask the General Conference to legislate upon it; for this would be putting to hazard what has already been settled by much higher authority than an annual, or than even the General Conference possesses.

“I could not petition the General Conference to allow the annual conference to enjoin the observance of the Sabbath day; for, *first*, this is enjoined already, by higher authority; and, *secondly*, authority to *enjoin*, implies authority to *dispense* with the observance of the Sabbath. And so with regard to opposing slavery, I could not ask the General Conference to allow the annual conferences to take measures against slavery. This the whole spirit of revelation has done as with the voice of a thousand oracles; this the prophets and apostles have written as with sunbeams. Besides, how can we petition Congress this year by ‘wholesale,’ and at the same time wait for the General Conference to define the rights of the annual conferences? The General Conference does not meet for some time to come.

\* See discussion between Pope and Maguire, Dublin, 1827.

## THE EPISCOPACY.

When that body of ministers do meet, it is uncertain whether they will do any thing more than they have done already. You think they have not defined the rights of the annual conferences. The bishops think they have, and have acted upon that assumption. Is it, then, reasonable to suppose that, when the General Conference come together, they will censure the bishops for having acted without authority, or that the latter will be ready to concede this point? By no means!

"The abolitionists do not ask the General Conference to define the rights of the annual conferences with respect to moral and religious doctrine and action. These matters have all been settled by God himself, and that long ago. Let it once be ascertained what is truth in doctrine, and what is right in action, and no man or body of men have a right to interpose to prevent our believing the one, or performing the other.

## WHAT WE DO NOT WISH.

"No evidence has, or can be given to show that the General Conference can define or *divine* what will be our duty as annual conferences in time to come. In the progress of society, new relations between man and man are progressively developing, and new duties are brought to view, all growing out of the principles of divine revelation. Thus it has been with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Annual conferences have increased; religious, moral, and literary institutions have been multiplied,—all imposing new obligations, and requiring new duties. Thus it will continue to be for years, perhaps ages yet to come. That it has been thus with us, is matter of record; that it will continue to be thus, is more than probable conjecture. When the New England Conference found the need of a religious paper, it instituted one, and its right to do so was never called in question. Thus we instituted an academy at New Market, and afterwards resolved ourselves into a Sabbath school society, and appointed a travelling agent to go through the conference and promote the interest of Sabbath schools, and no question was ever had as to the right of a conference to do so.

"And why may not an annual conference form an anti-slavery society, with a view to bring about the emancipation of two and a half millions of our fellow-creatures who are held in cruel bondage? This is the ground of the whole difficulty between the bishops and the conference. The former say the conference have no right to do thus; the latter say they have a right, and before God dare not relinquish it. They understand the word of God to them to be of this tenor,—'Lift up thy voice like a trumpet, show the people their sins; break every yoke, and let the oppressed go free; plead the cause of the oppressed,' &c. And have they no right to obey God, *as a conference*, till the General Conference give them *permission*? Where do we learn this? Will it be said that we have this right as individuals, but not in our associate capacity as a conference? Nay, if we have this right as individuals, we have it much more as a conference, for the plain reason, that, in all great and good causes, the many are better than the few,—better than a man single handed and alone.

"You intimate that to push this subject at the present time may subvert 'episcopacy.' If it should do this, it will not be the fault of the abolitionists. They have not, so far as I recollect, uttered a *single complaint* against episcopacy, or the constitution of the church. So far from this, they have considered the Discipline as the bulwark of our Zion. Their complaint is that *some* of the bishops have departed from the spirit of the Discipline in their administration. The Discipline declares slavery to be a 'great evil,' and we add, and *prove*, that it is a great sin against God and man. And have we no right to seek the removal of that evil? It is marvellous that any of our bishops should deny us this right, and, especially, that they should do it under present circumstances, and at the present juncture. They know that the eye of the Christian world is upon our bishops, and that the most vulnerable point in Methodism is their power; that not many years since, the whole church was greatly agitated on this point, and that a large body seceded on this very ground. Will the present course of those bishops have a tendency to heal the wound then inflicted, cheer its friends, and conciliate its enemies? The abolitionists have no wish to agitate the general question of episcopacy, and only ask that the government of the church may be administered according to the Discipline.

## PUBLIC DISCUSSION.

"Again—you think it wrong to publish throughout the land, that he (the bishop) deprived us of our rights at the late conference. But have you forgotten, my brother, that the sessions of our conference were open, and that the bishop declared his sentiments *publicly*? How, then, are the abolitionists to blame for discussing them publicly? If they charged him falsely, if they impeached his motives or his sincerity, they have done wrong. But I am not aware that they have done either of these things. The nature of the present controversy with the bishops is not, I am persuaded, well understood. We do not blame the bishops for not seeing as we see, thinking as we think, or even for not acting as we act; but for opposing us, and throwing all their influence in the way of *our acting* as we conscientiously believe we ought to act. The object is one of immense importance,—the emancipation of not fewer than two and a half millions of our fellow-creatures. Towards the accomplishment of this object, we believe we can act more efficiently in our conference character. And, indeed, on several subjects of great interest, we can act in no other character. We can act in no other character on petitions sent by our brethren to the annual conference, and in no other can we elect delegates to the General Conference. It is well known that the General Conference is now divided, that a *large and rapidly increasing minority* are abolitionists. The hopes of the slaves are built on their increase, and the success of their measures. Many who believe this, think we ought to wait till the General Conference, before we take any decisive steps. But these, surely, do not consider that, if no decisive steps are taken *before*, none can be taken *then*. The character

of the next General Conference *will be precisely the character of the delegates who compose it. The conferences which have the power to choose ABOLITION DELEGATES, are bound by every thing sacred in HUMANITY and RELIGION to do so.* And in order to do so, they must take some *previous steps.* Now, if the bishops will only cease from opposing the Conferences which have a majority of abolitionists, the latter will have no contention with them. And this we conceive they might consistently and safely do. There is no rule of the Discipline which makes it their duty to oppose a majority of an annual conference.

## PART V.

### UNAUTHORIZED CONVENTIONS IN THE CHURCH.

The above is the title of two or three columns of editorial in the 600th number of the Christian Advocate and Journal. Our brethren seem to have become very much alarmed. The Middletown agitator seems to have lashed himself up into a great excitement! He cannot away with Methodist anti-slavery societies and conventions. Their influence he thinks must be dreadful! What may we do, Br. Fisk? "You must not speak a word through our official paper; you must not have any conference action on slavery; you must not form any anti-slavery societies in the church, nor hold any anti-slavery conventions in the church; you must not agitate the church with discussions on this subject; neither must you say any thing against the authorities of the church, whatever they may do." This appears to be the amount of the liberty our brethren would allow us.

#### OTHER THINGS UNAUTHORIZED.

But let us spend a few moments upon these "unauthorized conventions." The editor thinks this the most dangerous project that has ever been agitated, if we except a proposition for an anti-slavery missionary society. But what harm, I ask, can arise from conventions composed of our ministers and members,

to deliberate upon the subject of slavery? "But there is no Discipline for these societies and conventions in the church." Neither is there any Discipline for temperance societies in the church. But we have conference temperance societies, and Methodist temperance societies. And there would be no more impropriety in holding a Methodist temperance convention than there is in forming temperance societies in the church,—and no impropriety in either.

Drunkenness and slavery are put in our Discipline in the same light: if, then, temperance societies and conventions are proper, so are anti-slavery societies and conventions.

There is no Discipline for camp or protracted meetings. The latter especially, are of recent and somewhat obscure origin. They have been opposed, too, and that *warmly* by *Methodists*. But temperance societies and protracted meetings have outlived opposition; so will anti-slavery societies and conventions. The former were once as new and unpopular in our church as the latter are now; and they are as much unauthorized by the Discipline as the latter. If inference and implication authorize the former, inference and implication authorize the latter. There are many other things not particularly authorized by the Discipline, that are, nevertheless, allowed to be altogether proper.

## SCHISM.

"But these anti-slavery societies and conventions tend to *schism*!" Who says so? Pres. Fisk, and Rev. Messrs. N. Bangs and S. Luckey. Well, what does this *prove*? Why, just as much as it would for G. Storrs, L. R. Sunderland, and O. Scott to say, that the measures of anti-abolitionists tend to schism! We might undoubtedly charge *them* with being schismatics, with much more reason than they charge us. The call for the Lynn convention expressly disavowed the intention of any thing revolutionary; and the first resolution which was passed at said convention, clearly expressed the same sentiment. No revolutionary measures were adopted. The call for the Utica convention expressly disavows the intention of any revolutionary measures. This call is signed by such fanatics as Scott, Storrs, Sunderland, Perkins and Randall. But still we are accused of "schism." And with as good a grace, perhaps, as the Protestants are accused of "heresy" by the Catholics. When have we ever indirectly advised our opponents to leave the church? When have we ever pretended that we have a right to monopolize the whole of our official paper to advocate what we believe to be the doctrines of Methodism, and thus exclude our brethren, even whole conferences, from the opportunity so much as to *explain* when they judge they have been misrepresented? *We* have never done these things. But are they not done; and that, too, by the very men who are out against schism? The *true schismatics*, however, are known by their fruits.

But what harm is there in our anti-slavery conventions? The very same men who have objected to these, have objected to all anti-slavery societies *in the church*. But we shall neither give up the one nor the other, while there is so much call for them as there is at present. Our opponents do not fear so much that the abolitionists will *leave the church*, as they do that a *majority* of the church will become *abolitionists*, and a general reformation thus take place. They know that if the anti-slavery reform goes on in the Methodist Episcopal Church for two years to come as it has done for two years past, a majority in the free States, both of the ministry and

laity, will be abolitionists! Therefore a mighty effort must be made to stop the progress of anti-slavery principles.

## LEAVING THE REGULAR WORK.

The object, it seems, is of sufficient importance to justify the missionary secretary in "leaving his regular work" to write on abolitionism, though he is advised by the General Conference "wholly to refrain." He must receive a salary of from \$1500 to \$2000 per annum, besides his travelling expenses, *from the funds of the missionary society*, to flood the United States, from week to week, with his lucubrations on abolitionism! In what part of the Discipline does he find writing against abolitionism among his duties *as missionary secretary*? It appears to me that his course, for several months past, has been more in accordance with *an anti-abolition agency*, than with the "appropriate" duties of missionary secretary. Since his "heart bled" so down in Virginia, anti-abolition has seemed to be the burden of his song. During the six or seven weeks, commencing with the 19th Jan., and ending with the 2d March, the missionary secretary has published, through the columns of the Advocate, *thirteen mammoth columns* on the exciting subject! And during this period, how many missionary meetings has he attended? How many searching communications *on the subject of missions* has he sent through the country, to stir up the people to liberality? Has he raised money enough, during the above mentioned time, *to pay his own salary*? Perhaps, he has; possibly a little more. But has the General Conference made him a "salaried" missionary agent to write on abolition?

Has not the very man who finds fault with others, for leaving their "appropriate work," to discuss the question of abolition, *done the very same himself*?

And has not the president of the Wesleyan University, another salaried church officer, left his appropriate work, to write on abolition? Some three months ago, he could not answer a few questions put to him by Mr. Birney, because he did "not receive a salary to write for the public." But from Jan. 19th to March 9th, [seven or eight weeks,] he has put forth in the Christian Advocate about *fifteen* columns over

his own proper name on the "exciting subject." He is also said to be the author of "*Honestus*," which makes two or three columns more. This looks like "not receiving a salary to write for the public." With how good a grace these brethren talk about others' "leaving their appropriate work," judge ye! Would it not have been more in keeping with their "appropriate work," for the secretary to have spent his energies on the subject of missions, and for the president to have done so on the cause of education? Or were these doctors *chosen* and *appointed* by the "party" to throw themselves into the eminently deadly breach, to stay the rising tide of abolitionism? Did the senior editor of the *Advocate* need the semi-editorial assistance of these salaried officers, to help him breast the storm of *old Wesleyan principles*? If so, I have not a word to say. I do not pretend that no circumstances could justify them in leaving their "appropriate work," but certainly the call should have been very loud to have justified them in "agitating the Church with discussions on abolitionism," especially in view of that authoritative precept, "wholly refrain!" The world is perishing for the lack of knowledge: we are doing comparatively nothing in the cause of missions; not fifteen cents a member upon the average, *per annum*; and as we have but one "special agent" in the whole connection devoted to the work of raising funds for the missionary cause, it does appear to me, that he ought not to engage in discussions upon the exciting topics of the day, so as to *engross his time* and *injure his influence* in the missionary work. I am sure there must be work enough in this *vast field*, to occupy the *entire time of one man*! If, however, the Church is willing thus to appropriate her funds, I have no objection to make to the course of these brethren. Being in favor of *free discussion*, I will be the last man to gag a brother on any subject.

#### NO EXCLUSIVE PRIVILEGES.

If our opponents think it best to hold a great *anti-abolition convention*, I will not object. There is no Discipline to prevent it, that I know of. They have a right peaceably to assemble and ex-

press their views on slavery and abolition, *and so have we*. They, however, can speak through annual conferences, and through our official papers, but we cannot. Hence the call for such conventions is greater in our case, than in theirs. By such conventions we violate no law or rule of Discipline. We have a *legal, moral, and Methodist* right, to assemble by *tens, hundreds, or thousands*, and bear our testimony against slavery. And as we cannot speak to the Church through her official periodicals, and as we have no "conference rights" on this subject, it is believed to be our *solemn duty*, at this juncture, both as friends of humanity and lovers of Methodism, to come together from different states and conferences, and deliberate upon these important matters. We regret that this necessity exists; but such is the fact. And for the existence of anti-slavery societies and conventions among our ministers and members, our bishops and other opponents, may thank themselves. Could we have had the same right in a conference capacity to oppose slavery, which our opponents have had to oppose abolitionism and defend slavery, these conventions would have had no existence. We are ready to dispense with them at any time, when as preachers, we can have our rights in the conferences; and when, as members, we can be heard by our petitions and memorials, in the conferences. But our bishops, who have denied to the conferences the right to refer memorials from our people to a committee, when they have asked for nothing but what was perfectly *constitutional*, and in the judgment of the conference *important*, have, at the same time, denied to thousands of our members their rights. Hence the necessity of conventions, and conventions, too, composed of *ministers and laymen*!

#### REASONS FOR CONVENTIONS.

The administration of two of our bishops has oppressed, afflicted, and grieved us all. Memorials, signed by 3400 of our members, have been refused a *reference*, and even a *RECEPTION*! Yes, the presiding bishop decided that a motion which went to express the sentiment that these memorials were received and in the possession of the confer-

ence, *was not in ORDER!* And he refused an appeal from this decision!!!

When, therefore, our people, by thousands, request us, their servants, to bear our solemn testimony against a great moral evil, and our bishops refuse to permit us, even to *receive* and *refer* their petitions, "is there not a *cause*?" Is there not a call for conventions and discussions? Is there not a reason why these ministers and laymen should assemble and confer together? If we must be deprived of our conference rights, and our members must be deprived of their right to petition, or which amounts to the same thing, *to be heard*, and we have not left us the common rights of *citizens*, and may not meet in conventions, because we are *Methodists*, then indeed is it not time to inquire whether we have any rights; and whether we are not ourselves slaves! We ask nothing but strict, sheer justice; nothing extraordinary; nothing out of the common course of things. The same liberty to oppose the sin of slavery, that we have to oppose other sins, is all we ask. The same right to sustain the Discipline, which other conferences, without opposition from bishops, exercise in trampling it under foot, is all we claim.—While other conferences, in conference capacity, oppose abolition, and declare that slavery "is not a moral evil," we think it *cruel oppression*, that we cannot be permitted to speak out the sentiments of *Methodism*, on the subject of slavery! What have we done that we should be disfranchised? Give us the rights that are allowed to anti-abolition conferences; the rights that are allowed to us on every other subject, and we will be satisfied. And if we cannot have these rights *on our own ground*, in the conferences, we must take the next best course, namely, CONVENTIONS! Here we can elect our own chairman, and here *Christians* can oppose *all sin*!

#### COLONIZATION.

The subject of colonization demands a passing notice. A pamphlet, by Rev. W. Fisk, now before me, presents its claims very forcibly, in contrast with abolitionism. A brief review of this pamphlet is all my limits will allow. And what I have to say upon this sub-

ject, I shall address directly to President Fisk.

#### PRESIDENT FISK AND COLONIZATION.

*Dear Brother*,—The fact, that your address on colonization was delivered between two and three years ago, does not make a review of it the less important. Indeed, as you have had time for reflection, and as you have neither retracted nor modified any of the sentiments contained in that pamphlet, they assume, if possible, more importance as time rolls on, and light spreads abroad. We may, therefore, fairly presume, that your sentiments on colonization in 1835, are your sentiments in 1838. And as a review of this address will be, in substance, a review of all similar productions; and as your talents and general knowledge of the whole system, give you the ability to present the subject in the strongest possible light; and as I write principally for the benefit of that Church of which you are a member and an ornament; and as I am willing to meet the *strongest positions* of a master mind in a single production;—I therefore select your address, delivered at Middletown, Conn., July 4, 1835, and afterwards published under *your own supervision*, as the subject of a few strictures.

#### QUESTION PROPOSED.

In this address, after some introductory remarks, you propose to discuss the grave question, "what can *we* do" to benefit "the colored population of our country?" You think we have nothing to do with the question, "What can the *whole nation* do?" In this, I differ from you so widely, that I think we have something to do with the question, "What can our brethren in the South do?" But this you deny.

If we have nothing to do with the question, "what can the whole nation do," who has? I am surprised not only, that such an expression could fall from your *lips*, but more especially, that in your study, it could deliberately drop from your *pen*! A Fourth of July congregation nothing to do with *national questions*? This willingness to get rid of responsibility, is, I believe, rather peculiar to anti-abolitionists; but it is very unlike Br. Fisk, on other occasions, and

in other matters. I doubt not you will see on reflection, that you have committed an error here. Connecticut is as *really* responsible for national evils, which can be remedied by the general government, as though they existed in that state; I do not say to the *same extent*. Will you say that your meaning was, that a Middletown congregation could not legislate for the nation? Neither can it legislate for the state. But it is a part of the nation, as really as a part of the state.

And to say that we have nothing to do with slavery in the South, is a new edition of the doctrine of Cain; "Am I my brother's keeper?" And a sentiment, which I presume, you would not apply to temperance, even if all the alcohol and all the drunkards were in South Carolina; and if rum making and rum drinking were among their "civil institutions"—and sanctioned by their laws! You would feel that you had a *moral right* to oppose such evils, which no human enactments could wrest from you; and that, if you could not safely oppose them in the South, you ought to oppose them in the North, especially, if what you do *here, could be known and felt there*. And with the knowledge you now have of the *fact*, that the public sentiment of the North, on the temperance question, has not only affected the South, but also all Europe, you would not pretend to excuse yourself from action, because a few state lines happened to intervene between you and the existence of the evil. You call the southerners "our brethren," and yet pretend that we are under no obligation to tell them their faults, because, forsooth, it is a very delicate matter!

#### COMPARATIVE CLAIMS.

The address proceeds to examine the comparative claims of the American Colonization, and the American Anti-Slavery Societies, to public confidence and patronage, as a means by which to elevate and improve the condition of one sixth part of the population of these United States.

#### STRANGE STATEMENT!

Before setting out in this investigation, you state, that

"It is a *fact*, that the *GREAT WHOLE* of the colonizationists are abolitionists. They desire

and expect the final abolition of slavery: and are impelled forward and cheered in this work, by this expectation."

By what authority, my dear sir, are you authorized to make such statements? Surely, not by your constitution. For, it is worthy of remark, that the constitution of the American Colonization Society, is without any preamble setting forth the *sentiments* and *motives* of its members—and there is not a word in it, touching slavery or abolition. Its operations, however, have always been opposed to abolition. *It originated with slave holders*—all its presidents have been *slave holders*—its first board of managers, and twelve out of the seventeen of its first vice-presidents were *slave holders*! This looks like the "*GREAT WHOLE*," being abolitionists! The Lord have mercy on the slaves if they are to be made free through the influence of such abolitionists as these, or such abolitionists as colonizationists generally are. The object of the society, as set forth in the second article of the constitution, is to get rid of the free people of color; and, therefore, they propose to colonize them "in Africa, or *such other place* as Congress shall deem most expedient." Their object is to *get rid of them*; and they are not so tenacious about taking them back to the land of their fathers, but what they will willingly co-operate with Congress, in planting them any where else that should be deemed expedient—even beyond the Rocky Mountains!

Will you say, that the abolition character of the society is not to be gathered from its constitution, nor yet from its operations, but from the declarations of its official organs? Very well, I will meet you here. If these witnesses prove the "*great whole*" of colonizationists to be abolitionists, either immediate or gradual, I will cede the point—but if they prove directly the reverse, it will remain for *you* to reconcile your sweeping statements with *facts*. To the law and to the testimony.

#### FACTS PROVING THAT COLONIZATIONISTS ARE ABOLITIONISTS.

"It is *no Abolition Society*: it addresses, as yet, arguments to no master. It denies the design of attempting emancipation *PARTIAL* or *GENERAL*." *Address of J. B. Harrison to Lynchburgh Col. Society. Af. Rep. III. 197.*

"Into their (the Society's) accounts, the sub-

ject of emancipation does not ENTER AT ALL." *Af. Rep. IV. p. 306.*

"The friends of colonization wish to be distinctly understood on this point. From the beginning, they have disavowed, and they do yet disavow, that their object is the emancipation of slaves." *Speech of J. S. Green, before the New Jersey Society.*

"From its origin, and throughout the whole period of its existence, it has constantly disclaimed ALL INTENTION WHATEVER of interfering in the smallest degree with the rights of property, or the object of emancipation, *gradual or immediate.*" *Speech of Mr. Clay, V. President. Af. Rep. VI. p. 13.*

"Recognizing the constitutional and legitimate existence of slavery, it seeks not to interfere, directly or indirectly, with the rights it creates." *Af. Rep. III. p. 16.*

"He considered himself publicly pledged, so long as he had any thing to do with the Society, to resist every attempt to connect it with emancipation, either in theory or practice." *Speech of Gen. Jones, a Manager of the Am. Col. Soc. 22d Jan. 1834.*

"The emancipation of slaves, or the amelioration of their condition, with the moral, intellectual, and political improvement of the people of color within the United States, are objects FOREIGN to the powers of this Society." *Address of the Board of Managers to its Auxiliaries. Af. Rep. VII. p. 291.*

So much for the "great whole" of colonizationists being abolitionists. I will now show that they OPPOSE emancipation unless it be connected with banishment.

"Any scheme of emancipation, without colonization, they know to be productive of nothing but evil." *Speech of Mr. Key, a V. President. Af. Rep. IV. p. 300.*

"We would say, liberate them ONLY on condition of their going to Africa or Hayti." *Af. Rep. III. p. 26.*

"I am strongly opposed to emancipation in EVERY SHAPE and DEGREE, unless accompanied by colonization." *Letter from R. G. Harper, V. President, to the Secretary of the Society, 20th August, 1817.*

"It is a well established point, that the public safety forbids either the emancipation or the general instruction of the slaves." *7th Report, p. 94.*

"So long as we can hold a pen, we will employ it heart and hand, against the advocates of immediate emancipation, or ANY emancipation that does not contemplate expatriation." *N. Y. Courier and Enquirer, a Col. paper, 10th July, 1834.*

"Emancipation, with liberty to remain on this side of the Atlantic, is but an act of dreamy madness." *Speech of Mr. Custis, 13th Report, p. 8.*

"What right, I demand, have the children of Africa to a homestead in the white man's country?" *Speech of Mr. Custis, 14th Report, p. 21.*

"The Managers could with no propriety depart from their original and avowed purpose, and make emancipation their object. And they would further say, that if they were not thus restrained by the terms of their association,

they would still consider any attempts to promote the increase of the free colored population by manumission, unnecessary, premature, and dangerous." *Memorial of the American Col. Soc. to the several State Legislatures. Af. Rep. II. p. 60.*

"This law, (a law of Virginia, by which a manumitted negro becomes again a slave if he remains twelve months in the state,) odious and unjust as it may at first view appear, and hard as it may seem to bear upon the liberated negro, was doubtless dictated by sound policy, and its repeal would be regarded by none with more unfeigned regret than the friends of African Colonization. It has restrained many masters from giving freedom to their slaves, and has thereby contributed to check the growth of an evil already too great and formidable." *Memorial from Powhatan Col. Soc. to Virginia Legislature.*

"To set them (the slaves) loose among us, would be an evil more intolerable than slavery itself." *Report of Kentucky Col. Soc. Af. Rep. VI. p. 81.*

"As long as our present feelings and PREJUDICES exist, the abolition of slavery cannot be accomplished without the removal of the blacks." *2d Report N. Y. Soc.*

I will bring other evidence, that the "great whole" of colonizationists are abolitionists, viz:—they justify and defend slavery. To say nothing of the Counter Appeal, that famous colonization document, I will only call your attention to the following authorities:—

"We hold their slaves, as we hold their other property, SACRED." *Speech of J. S. Green before N. Jersey Col. Soc. Af. Rep. I. p. 283.*

"To the slave holder, they (the society) address themselves in a tone of conciliation and sympathy. We know your rights, say they, and we respect them." *Af. Rep. VII. p. 100.*

"The rights of the masters are to remain SACRED in the eyes of the society." *Address of Rockbridge Col. Soc. Af. Rep. IV. p. 274.*

"We believe that there is not the slightest moral turpitude in holding slaves, under existing circumstances, in the South." *Af. Rep. IX. p. 4.*

"Policy, and even the voice of humanity, forbade the progress of manumission." *Af. Rep. IV. p. 268.*

"It would be as humane to throw them from the decks in the middle passage, as to set them free in our country." *Af. Rep. IV. p. 226.*

"It (the Society) condemns no man because he is a slave holder." *Editorial Article—Af. Rep. VII. p. 200.*

"Acknowledging the necessity by which its (slavery) present continuance, and rigorous provisions for its maintenance, are justified." *Af. Rep. III. p. 16.*

"It is the business of the free, their safety requires it, to keep the slaves in ignorance." *Proceedings of New York Col. Soc. 2d Ann.*

"The laws of Virginia now discourage, and very wisely, perhaps, the emancipation of slaves." *Speech of Mr. Mercer, V. President, 1st Rep.*

"They (the Abolitionists) confound the mis-



fortunes of one generation with the crimes of another." *Af. Rep.* VII. p. 202.

"I am not complaining of the owners of slaves: they cannot get rid of them." *Address before Hampden Col. Soc.* *Af. Rep.* IV. p. 226.

"Suppose the slaves of the South to have the knowledge of freemen, they would be free, or exterminated by the whites. This renders it necessary to prevent their instruction, and to keep them from Sunday schools, or the means of gaining knowledge." *Proceedings of N. Y. Col. Soc.* 2d Ann. Rep.

"The treatment of the slave is in general as good as circumstances and the cruel necessity of the case will permit." *Proceedings of N. York Col. Soc.* 2d Ann. Rep.

"What but sorrow can we feel at the misguided piety which has set so many of them free by death-bed devise, or sudden conviction of injustice?" *Address to Lynchburg Col. Soc.* *Af. Rep.* III. p. 193.

"Slavery is an evil entailed upon the present generation of slaveholders, which they must suffer, whether they will or not." *Af. Rep.* V. p. 179.

#### IT BENEFITS SLAVERY.

I will now show, that Colonizationists hold out the idea to slaveholders, that the operations of the Society will make their property in human beings more profitable and safe; and this, it would seem, is another evidence that the "great whole" of Colonizationists are Abolitionists. In the Second Annual Report, p. 9, the Board of Managers express an opinion, that the

"Colonization of the free people of color, will render the slave who remains in America, more obedient, more faithful, more honest, and consequently more useful to his master."

Again:

"By removing the most fruitful sources of discontent (the free blacks) from among our slaves, we should render them more industrious and attentive to our commands." *Address of Putnam (Georgia) Col. Soc.*

"What greater pledge can we give for the moderation and safety of our measures, than our own interests as slaveholders, and the ties that bind us to the slave-holding community to which we belong." *Speech of Mr. Key, Vice Pres.* 11th Rep. p. 14.

"To remove these persons (the free blacks) from among us, will increase the usefulness, and improve the moral character of those who remain in servitude, and with whose labors the country is unable to dispense." *Af. Repository*, III. 67.

"The tendency of the scheme, and one of its objects, is to secure slaveholders, and the whole southern country, against certain evil consequences growing out of the present three-fold mixture of our population." *Address of a Virginia Col. Soc.* *Af. Repos.* IV. 274.

"By removing these people, (free blacks,) we rid ourselves of a large party who will always be ready to assist our slaves in any mis-

chievous designs they may conceive." *Address to a Col. Soc. in Virginia.* *Af. Rep.* I. 176.

"Are they (the free blacks) vipers, sucking our blood? We will HURL them from us."—*Address to Lynchburg Col. Soc.* *Af. Repository* III. 201.

"By thus repressing the rapid increase of blacks, the white population would be enabled to reach, and soon overtop them; the consequence would be SECURITY." *Af. Rep.* IV. 344.

"The free negroes corrupt our slaves. From what has been adduced, the expediency of removing this NUISANCE from the community is clearly inferable, both in relation to their interests and ours; and this can only be attained by means of the Colonization Society."—*Internal Improvements of South Carolina, by Robert Mills*, p. 15.

"The removal of every single free black in America, would be productive of nothing but SAFETY to the slave-holder." *Af. Rep.* III. 202.

"So far from having a dangerous tendency, when properly considered, it will be viewed as an additional guard to our peculiar species of property." *New Orleans Argus.*

Now, dear sir, in view of the above facts, who will believe that the "great whole" of the colonizationists, are in any sense, or any form, abolitionists? And how could my Br. Fisk pretend this? Is it possible that he is so ignorant of the designs and operations of that society? I do not doubt that you desire the ultimate abolition of slavery, nor that some other colonizationist would be glad to have such an object accomplished some time between now and never; but I do affirm, that the "great whole" of those negro-hating philanthropists are decided anti-abolitionists.

#### COMPARISON OF CAUSES.

You say, on page 6, "We come before the public to compare causes with the abolitionists; we compare principles, and practices, and fruits—which enterprise most favorably affects the interests of the man of color?"

Here we will meet you, and abide the consequences of a faithful examination of "principles, PRACTICES, and FRUITS."

#### SENTIMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO US.

You say, on the same page, that we "delight in finding and representing" slavery "the worst possible,"—that we "apply rare instances of enormous cruelty" "to the entire slave-holding South." This is denied, and the proof is challenged!

And, again, "some of their lecturers have said publicly, that one of the great-

est difficulties, in the progress of their principles, was the fact, that some of the slave owners treated their slaves with kindness?" *When? Where? what lecturers* ever manifested dissatisfaction on account of the slaves being treated with "kindness?" Will you please give us names, dates, and places. If you had said, that we consider the fact that *good men* (!) are slave holders, to be one of the greatest obstacles in the way of emancipation, you would have come nearer the truth. But we deny having ever found fault with "kind treatment." Has not the reputed author of the Scripture Argument, which was designed to justify the relation of master and servant, under certain circumstances, never represented, that the influence of *good men*—Christians, deacons, and ministers, was worse than that of the unprincipled and abandoned; on the *temperance question*? Has he ever written a labored scripture argument, to justify the relation of *rum and religion*, "under certain circumstances?" Or has he ever turned out of his way to defend the good rum-maker—the good rum-seller—the good rum-drinker? I think not. And yet, what Mr. Wesley very properly terms "the most complicated villany," you have labored hard to justify, "under certain circumstances"—and that too, from the Bible!!

On page 7 you say, the national legislature has "*nothing*" to do with slavery in the slave holding States. You had forgotten, perhaps, that the constitution of the United States gives Congress the right to "regulate commerce between the States;" and that it follows, as a matter of course, that the national legislature can abolish the trade in human beings between the States.

You say, on page 8, that the abolitionists hold, that "freeing the slaves, by sending them out of the States, where the laws will not admit of emancipation"—"would involve the principles of colonization, and would be a *moral crime*." This assertion is supported with the *same kind* of evidence of those contained in your pamphlet generally, which is *just none at all*.

You remark again, "neither do they (the abolitionists) seem anxious to persuade *this or that* individual to emancipate his slaves," &c. Now whether

"they seem anxious" or not, they have persuaded a number of individuals, (six hundred at least), to emancipate their slaves. By what system of logic will you make it appear that "*this and that* individual" are not included among the thousands to whom they are constantly addressing their arguments? Now, did it ever occur to you, that because you preach that every body ought to be temperate, you are not anxious to "persuade *this or that* individual" to be temperate? Or did you ever think of being satisfied with that kind of *gradualism*, on the temperance question, which only aims to "persuade *this or that* individual" to be temperate? If you had said that such a gradualism does not *satisfy us*—that we lay the axe at the root of the tree—and that a "wholesale business," as it respects the destruction of all sin, is our object, you would not have materially erred. A gradualism of "*this and that*"—one which is to commence at some indefinite future period, and be perfected half way between now and never, may fill up the cup of colonization benevolence, but it is "too small a business for modern abolitionists!" But you will say that your system of gradualism has *already commenced*—that some "have emancipated their slaves, for the express purpose of placing them under the action of this society." That is, in plain English, for the express purpose of banishment! You will not, I presume, claim, that many instances of emancipation did not take place before the colonization society existed, or you or I were born. Of course, the "retail business" of "*this and that*," did not originate with colonizationists, as they would make people believe. The probability is, had this society never existed, all who have been emancipated and *banished*, and many more, would have been emancipated and left upon the soil. But now, since this *negro-hating system* of colonization was got up, the slave holder, who is disposed to emancipate, holds on upon his slaves, till they can be banished; this society, more than any thing else, as I shall show hereafter, having greatly strengthened the wicked prejudices that exist in this country against color. And yet it modestly claims all the philanthropy of the nation, so far as the blacks are concerned.

## WHAT HAS BEEN DONE?

On the 9th page of your address, you say, we have not, to your knowledge, emancipated a *single slave*,—and by way of answering an objection to the operations of the colonization society, you ask, “How long it will take us to emancipate all the slaves in the United States?” I answer; with the blessing of God, we will have them all free, long before the colonization society will convey to Africa the increase of the colored population for a *single year*! On the principles of their past operations, it will require more than five hundred years to remove as many as are born in a single year!

This is gradualism with a witness!! Go on, my brother, with your “retail business,” you are carrying away *two hundred* a year, where they can be free from the prejudices of *Americans*, while the *net* increase of the colored population is about *sixty thousand* a year!

You might have asked the British abolitionists, after they had toiled eight or ten years without emancipating a single slave, how long it would take them, in that ratio, to emancipate all the slaves in the West India islands? And they might have answered in your language, “that great and permanent enterprises, generally have small beginnings, and at first a slow growth,”—but the next year or the next month, *eight hundred thousand* voices might have answered the question with acclamations! Ah! but you will say that was a different thing. Indeed it was, in some respects—but *abolition measures* accomplished the work *there*, and the same measures, on the same principle, will accomplish it here, at least to some extent. Our Congress has the same right to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, slavery in the territories, and the slave trade *between* the States, as the British Parliament had to abolish slavery in the West India islands. When the General Government has done all this, and when public sentiment and moral suasion have done all they can, we shall see how much slavery will be left in our country.

You said the abolitionists had not freed “one slave, to your knowledge.”—but your “knowledge” on this point has probably increased since you penned

that sentence; if it has not, I will, at your suggestion, increase it, by giving you a few *facts*. In the mean time, I will say in your language, that “we are laying the foundation of an enterprise, the benefits of which will be felt through all coming generations.”

## EVIL DONE BY ABOLITIONISTS.

At the following sentence, which occurs on the 10th page of your address, I am not a little surprised. You say, that it is “your sincere conviction, that should the abettors of Garrisonism live to the age of Methusaleh, and spend that life in *well directed efforts* to do good, they could not make amends for the *increased unhappiness* of which they have been the occasion, to the colored population of the *free States*.” I say at this sentence, I am exceedingly surprised! And what evidence do you find to support it? None at all. You pretend, however, that we have “excited the blacks to claim privileges that the community are not prepared to award them.” What privileges have they claimed, or what privileges have we claimed for them, that the Almighty has not *already* awarded them? “Community are not prepared to award them!” Neither was “community” prepared to award to our fathers the privileges they claimed, when they put forth the Declaration of Independence! And suppose *they* had waited for the community to get ready? How is “community” ever to be “prepared to award” to the blacks their rights? Can colonizationism accomplish this work? Certainly not. For that system is built on the principle, that the blacks cannot be elevated *here*. It fosters and strengthens existing prejudices against them.

You talk about the “increased unhappiness” of which we have been the occasion to the blacks in the free States, and for which we cannot make atonement in *nine hundred years*! In reply, I have only to say, that this is a *pretty fair sample of your whole pamphlet*.

## THE APPROPRIATE FIELD.

You next assert, that “the *direct* and *appropriate* field for the colonization society, is the elevation of the free man of color to the high privileges of citizenship and independence.” You also say,

"I know they have not, like most anti-slavery societies, an article in their constitution, binding the members to endeavor to improve the character and condition of the free people of color."—pp. 10 and 11.

Now for the proof, that the American Colonization Society is elevating the free colored population to the "high privileges of citizenship and independence?" You will admit, I suppose, that colonizationists love the negroes *the best the farthest off*. You say, they can be only "nominally" free *here*—that prejudice against them is "natural and invincible!" Native-born citizens of the United States, cannot be free in their own country, because of the prejudices of Christian Americans! And a Doctor of Divinity affirms, that these "prejudices" are, "to a certain extent, *natural and invincible!*" Yes, and you say, too, that "care should be taken to say little of the *unreasonableness and criminality* of the existing prejudice"—even while attempting to do away so much of it as you attribute to education. The subject of this prejudice, you say, should not be "commanded by all the sanctions of *moral obligation*, to feel and act differently." How, my brother, can you throw your influence in favor of these existing ungodly prejudices, and even represent them as inseparable from our nature, thus attributing them to *nature's God*? Does this wickedness need your palliations and apologies? But in this, you are a *consistent colonizationist*! Prejudice against color is the corner stone of that society. Destroy this, and the whole fabric would be paralyzed. For the "public taste" would then admit of their being elevated *here*.

Who have abused and slandered the free colored people of our country, through the whole length and breadth of the land? *Colonizationists*. Yes, colonizationists have ground them to the dust with millstones of slander and prejudice! They have represented them as the "filth and offscouring of all things"—as the "most vicious"—"subsisting by thefts and plunder"—"a *curse and contagion*"—"a vile excrescence upon society"—"the most *corrupt, depraved and abandoned* race on the earth," &c. And these *slanderers* are our *national philanthropists*! Their "appropriate

field" is the "elevation of the free man of color!!" Whatever influence your scheme may exert in Africa, it has a most deleterious influence upon the free blacks of this country. You cannot find in all the records extant, so many hard and wicked things said of the negroes, as colonizationists have said, within the last twenty years. Take the following as a sample.

#### COLONIZATION SLANDERS.

"Free blacks are a greater *NUISANCE* than even slaves themselves."—*Address of C. C. Harper, Af. Rep. II. 189.*

"A horde of miserable people—the objects of universal suspicion—subsisting by plunder."—*Speech of Gen. Mercer, Vice President.*

"Of all classes of our population, the most *vicious* is that of the free colored—contaminated themselves, they extend their vices to all around them."—*Speech of Mr. Clay, Vice President, 12th Report, p. 21.*

"Averse to labor, with no incentives to industry, or motives to respect, they maintain a precarious existence by petty thefts and plunder."—*Af. Rep. VI. 135.*

"They are alike injurious by their conduct and example to all other classes of society."—*Memorial of Manchester Col. Soc. to Virginia Legislature.*

"A large mass of human beings who hang as a *vile excrescence* upon society."—*Address of C. L. Mosby, before a Col. Soc. in Virginia.*

"This class of persons a *CURSE AND CONTAGION* wherever they reside."—*Af. Rep. III. 203.*

"Of all the descriptions of our population, and of *either* portion of the African race, the free persons of color are by far, as a class, the most *corrupt, depraved, and abandoned*."—*Speech of Mr. Clay, African Rep. VI. 12.*

"Anomalous race of beings, the most *depraved upon earth*."—*African Rep. VII. 230.*

"They are a mildew upon our fields, a scourge to our backs, and a stain upon our escutcheon."—*Memorial of Kentucky Col. Soc. to Congress.*

"I will look no farther, when I seek for the most degraded, the most *abandoned race on the earth*, but rest my eye on this people."—*Address before the Lynchburgh Col. Soc.*

"There is a class (free blacks) among us, introduced by violence, notoriously ignorant, degraded and miserable, *mentally diseased*, broken spirited, acted upon by no motives to honorable exertions, scarcely reached in their debasement by the *heavenly light*."—*Editorial Article, Af. Rep. I. 68.*

"The moral, intellectual, and political improvement of people of color within the United States, are objects foreign to the powers of this Society."—*Address of the Am. Col. Soc. to its Auxiliaries. Af. Rep. VII. 291.*

"I am clear, that whether we consider it with reference to the welfare of the State, or the happiness of the blacks, it were better to have left them in *CHAINS*, than to have liberated them to receive such freedom as they enjoy, and greater freedom we cannot, must not allow them."—*Af. Rep. III. 197.*

"The habits, the feelings, all the prejudices

of society—prejudices which neither refinement, nor argument, nor education, NOR RELIGION ITSELF CAN subdue, mark the people of color, whether bond or free, as the subjects of a degradation inevitable and incurable.”—*Address of the Connecticut Col. Soc.*

“The managers consider it clear, that causes exist and are now operating to prevent their improvement and elevation to any considerable extent, as a class in this country, which are fixed not only beyond the control of the friends of humanity, but of any human power. CHRISTIANITY cannot do for them here what it will do for them in Africa. This is not the fault of the colored man, nor of the white man, but AN ORDINATION OF PROVIDENCE, and no more to be changed than the laws of nature.”—*15th Report*, p. 47.

“We do not ask, that the provisions of our Constitution and statute book should be so modified as to relieve and exalt the condition of the colored people whilst they remain with us. Let these provisions stand in ALL THEIR RIGOR, to work out the ultimate and unbounded good of these people.”—*Memorial of the N. Y. State Col. Soc. to the Legislature.*

“If the free people of color were generally taught to read, it might be an inducement to them to remain in this country; we would offer them no such inducements.”—*Southern Religious Telegraph*, Feb. 19 1831—a Colonization paper.

“The people of color must, in this country, remain for ages, probably for ever, a separate and distinct caste, weighed down by causes powerful, universal, invincible, which neither legislation nor CHRISTIANITY can remove.”—*Af. Rep. Ed. Art. VII.* 196.

You will perceive, from the above, that you are not alone in the sentiment, that prejudice is “natural and invincible.” In advocating this doctrine, you are no *heretic*. It is a generally received principle, among colonizationists, that Christianity cannot cure the prejudices of enlightened Americans; and they even charge this doctrine of caste upon the Almighty! They say, it is “an ordination of Providence, and no more to be changed than the laws of nature.” This principle of negro hatred is as far from the principles of Christianity as the east is from the west, by whom soever it may be justified and defended. And why are colonizationists constantly harping upon this string? How is this to benefit the colored people, either in this country or Africa? In this way, and in no other, namely, by increasing the prejudice of multitudes, till they are willing to give their money to get the objects of their hatred out of the country—and by deceiving others into the notion, that Africa possesses the power to raise incurable degradation to intelligence,

honor, respectability, and happiness and even to convert “*filth*,” that can scarcely be reached “by the heavenly light,” into Christian missionaries! The Colonization Society did not, it is true, originate this doctrine of caste, but it has given it *shape and form, strength and stability*.

#### WHAT HAS COLONIZATION DONE?

Colonization has paralyzed the efforts of the friends of the colored man, to elevate him in this country—it has broken up one colored school in Connecticut, and another in New Hampshire, and has prevented others from being established. Yes, and it has enacted laws to oppress the colored man, nay the colored *female* and the colored *child*! I know you say in a whisper, that you do not *approve* of the black law of Connecticut. But why do you not speak out in thunder-tones against such usurpation, oppression and wickedness? Did you ever think of being satisfied with saying, on one public occasion, in a soft whisper, that you do not *approve of drunkenness*!

How, my brother, can you countenance and support such a system of complicated evils, as that of African colonization? a system which justifies and strengthens the prejudices of *caste*. Could we have a colonization society, for the purpose of colonizing the prejudices of the *whites*, not in Africa, but in their *native place*, the bottomless pit, I would be a colonizationist!

The public, my dear sir, will soon understand, through the whole country, how colonizationists are “elevating the free colored man!” These are the men who bind him, hand and foot, and then complain that he will not move. They load him with discouragements, and then complain that he has no enterprise; shut him out of the halls of science, and then reproach him with his ignorance! These are the “fruits” of colonizationism in its “appropriate field” of “elevating the free colored man!”

#### FORCING THE PUBLIC TASTE.

You next bring your mighty artillery to bear upon the abolitionists, for attempting, as you say, to “force the public taste;” and in this you find an apology, if not a complete justification, for

the Connecticut "black law," which you so mildly disapproved! But what do you mean by "forcing the public taste?" Do you mean the preaching unpalatable doctrines? Very likely. But is the public taste always *right*? and, if not, should it not be corrected? Did not Jesus Christ and the apostles "force the public taste," and brave public opinions and prejudices? Did not Martin Luther and John Wesley do the same? and ought they not to be held responsible for the opposition and lawless violence which their "offensive" doctrines occasioned? Have you not, in many instances, in years past, forced the public taste, by your "offensive" temperance "claims?" To hear any man, and more especially a Christian minister, of high standing, talk about the "public taste" in this way, is really sickening. The first rule of duty, it would seem, in this time-serving age, is to consult the *public taste*! Spirit of the martyrs and reformers! where have ye fled?

You say the abolitionists, or "the practitioners" of "ill-omened empiricism," as you are pleased to call them, should be "*discountenanced*." You do not say that it should be done by mobs; for you hold them in "utter abhorrence;"—and what mobite is there who does not hold mobs in utter abhorrence? It is only to save the Constitution and the Union that they are resorted to—and yet you rather *palliate* the conduct of mobocrats, by representing that, "when the *public taste* is outraged, it revolts against the offensive cause;" and that our "impudence" has been "instrumental in exciting the mobs." Neither do you say that we should be discountenanced by *penal enactments*; we are therefore left to guess at your meaning. For opposing what the Methodist Discipline opposes, and what our fathers have considered an "enormous sin," one for which "perdition itself has scarcely an adequate place of punishment;" and for preaching the strange doctrine, that *all sin* ought *immediately* to cease, we should "be discountenanced!" "These offensive claims" ought not to be "pressed upon the public taste!" Taste, to be corrected or formed, must be courted by *palliatives*, by *gentle* approaches! So says Br. Fisk!

#### COLONIZATION REPUBLICS.

You talk about "the little *republics*," formed of people so *debased*, that the "heavenly light can scarcely reach" them, with no other qualification than *expatriation*, "studding the coasts of Africa," "rearing cities, building ships, and spreading abroad their commerce." But why cannot the colored people do all this *here*? O, "we won't let them!"

But let us look, for a moment, at those "little republics studding the coast of Africa." They are almost equal, in the aggregate, to Texas! The independent nation of Texas can muster about 4000 voters; and she has her foreign ministers, her congress, her army and navy, &c. And the little republics that stud the coast of Africa, it appears, from a late number of the Christian Advocate, have not only their state governments, but also their congress! Yes, a congress of *right* members, including the president! All the little republics, including men, women and children, make about 3000 in number. There may be 500 legal voters in all the "republics!" It would probably be their turn, next after Texas, to be annexed to the Union, but for that deep-rooted negro prejudice, which seems to be a very predominant trait in the character of our civil and religious institutions. But whether they are annexed to the Union or not, they are to have their *colleges* (!) as well as their state and national legislatures. I know not how much money has been collected to build a college in Liberia. They skip over common schools of course. Nothing short of a *college* will answer the demands of that mighty nation. *Here*, respectable colored gentlemen who are well qualified, are shut out of our colleges;—*there*, we must have a college to educate those who can scarcely be reached in their debasement by the "heavenly light," and who have scarcely learned to read and write in a primary school! *Here*, colored schools have been broken up, and that, too, by those who want the negroes colonized;—*there*, we must have a college for the great nation of 3000 souls! Really, this talk about a college, a congress, and republican states, is perfectly ridiculous! It is an insult to common sense! You might, with about as much propriety, talk of a college and a congress in a

*poor house.* The public well know how to appreciate this imposition.

Had the hundreds of thousands which have been spent in this work of *expatriation*, been applied to the work of killing our wicked prejudices, our schools at Canterbury and Canaan had not been broken up; our Cox and our Wright had probably still been here, pointing the sinner to Christ; and the poor colored people had not been so wickedly slandered. But this could not be: our prejudices, which you say are "natural and invincible," would not permit them to be educated either in Connecticut or New Hampshire, nor, indeed, any where else in this Christian land! But now we must have a college and a congress for them before they scarcely know their alphabet. This is our *Christian consistency!*

#### COLONY AT CAPE PALMAS.

The colony at Cape Palmas is, I suppose, one of the "republics" of Africa. And with respect to the prosperity of this little state, I have a few facts,—facts which represent the condition of the colony as so little preferable to slavery, that it would hardly be an object for Christian benevolence to free the slaves and banish them to that place. I am able to *prove* the following facts in relation to the condition of that colony, viz.: That the emigrants are generally sick most of the time for the first six months; that some of them die in the seasoning; that they suffer much in sickness for want of proper attentions, and from being put into leaky hovels,—in consequence of which their bed clothes are wet much of the time, and not unfrequently are rotted and spoiled; that the soil is little better for produce than a sand bank; that rice, peas, beans, corn, and potatoes, have been planted two years in succession, with no success; that these vegetables would grow out of the ground a few inches, and wither away, with the exception of the sweet potatoes, which grow as large as birds' eggs; that, when the colonists have consumed the six months' rations allowed them by the society, they suffer much from hunger; that, to sustain life, they have been obliged to sell their little necessities out of the house to the natives for rice, who raise it back in the swamps,

where the emigrants could not live; that the colonists would all be glad to get away, if they could; that they would generally prefer to come back to this country, and return to slavery, than stay where they are. These *facts*, and many more, I had from the lips of one who had lived at Cape Palmas two years, who was formerly a slave in Maryland, and who is recommended, both by his old master and the governor of the colony, as a man of *good character!* This man told me that he had much rather go into slavery, than back to the colony. So much for one of your "little republics that stud the coast, of Africa!" What cruelty and barbarity! Good land enough here, and yet our prejudices must banish the innocent natives of this country to a foreign and desolate land, and then call this horrid proscription a work of Christian philanthropy and benevolence! I say nothing of the condition of the other colonies at this time. The state of things may be better in some of them.

#### SLAVE TRADE.

There might, indeed, be some show of propriety for this *penance*, if any good were to result from it. I know you talk about destroying the *slave trade*, and converting the *natives*; but I ask, what slave ship has been captured by the colonies, or what native has been converted by your missionaries or colonists? Your agents and missionaries have told us, "the slave trade is still carried on within reach of the guns of Liberia;" and Gov. Pinney told me not long since, that there had not been, to his knowledge, a *SINGLE NATIVE CONVERTED* since the first colony was planted!

Now let us hear what the agents and ministers at Liberia say about the slave trade:

"The records of the colony afford abundant and unequivocal testimony of the undiminished extent and atrocity of the slave trade. From eight to ten, and even fifteen, vessels have been engaged at the same time in this odious traffic, almost within reach of the guns of Liberia."—*Rep. x. 44.*

"Frequently, within sight of the colonial factories, the slave traders carry on their operations. The slave trade never has been carried on with more activity than it is at this time."—*R. Randall, agent at Liberia, 1820.*

"It is painful to state, that the managers have reason to believe that the slave trade is still prosecuted to a great extent, and with

circumstances of undiminished atrocity. It now exists on the territory; and a little to the north and south of Liberia, it is seen in its true characters of fraud, rapine, and blood.—*13th Rep.* 1830.

"I hope the Board will adopt some more effectual measures for suppressing the slave trade within the territory of Liberia. I am sorry to state, this abominable traffic is carried on, with the utmost activity, all along the coast."—*A. D. Williams, Agent at Liberia.*—1830.

"With undiminished atrocity and activity is this odious traffic now carried on, all along the African coast; slave factories are established in the immediate vicinity of the colony."—*14th Rep.* 1831.

"The cursed practice of slave-trading, I regret to say, is still carried on between this and Sierra Leone."—*Rev. M. B. Coz.* 1833.

Now, I ask, what has the Colonization Society, or the colony at Liberia, done towards destroying the slave trade? I think it must be answered nothing at all! And I wish it could be said in truth, that the colonists have done nothing to perpetuate it! Would not the abolition of slavery be more likely to destroy the slave trade, than the planting of ten thousand colonies in Africa? Will the slave trade ever cease till slavery is abolished?

But I have not yet done with your address. You say on page 15, that "every instance of the elevation of the man of color, has a tendency to *loosen the cords of the slave.*" This is undoubtedly true. Hence many colonizationists are opposed to elevating him *here*; and hence too, they slander and keep him down *here*. And, I might add, hence the efforts of abolitionists to establish schools among the free colored people, which negro haters have destroyed.

#### DIVISION OF THE UNION.

On the 18th page of your address, you sound the old stereotyped note of alarm—"a division of the Union!"—And in doing this, you manifest, I believe, rather more southern chivalry than usually falls to the lot of one man even in the hot beds of slavery.

You say, "a political anti-slavery party will doubtless soon be organized, and when once this is made a question at the polls, its moral bearings will be lost sight of. If such a political party should succeed, nothing short of a dissolution of the Union will follow. Let no man flatter himself, that the South would not be inclined to revolt from the Union, or would not dare to do it. The South, sir, dare to do

any thing she is inclined to do; and there is nothing she would be more inclined to do, than to separate herself from the northern states, whenever they assume a political attitude in opposition to her *social and political rights—rights that were GUARANTIED to her, by the solemnities of CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, and PUBLICLY PLIGHTED FAITH.* Any political interference of ours, in that matter, would, to all intents and purposes, on this question, be a *foreign interference*; and, therefore, would be improper and injurious."\*

The above is, perhaps, the most important passage in your whole address. It is a passage, however, at which I am more surprised, than at any other, with perhaps the exception of your declaration, "that the great whole of the colonizationists are abolitionists."

#### RIGHTS OF CONGRESS.

That *you* could deliberately pass over the *rights of the General Government*, while contending with so much zeal, for *southern state rights*—rights to enslave human beings made in the image of God, is truly surprising! And yet you have, I believe, invariably done this, in all your anti-abolition efforts. You make no distinctions, but represent that the South has the entire control of the slave question; and that too, "by the solemnities of constitutional provisions, and publicly plighted faith." But you know better than this. You know that Congress has the right to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District and in the territories; and you probably agree with Daniel Webster and other eminent statesmen, that Congress having power to regulate commerce between the states, possess the right to abolish the slave trade between the states. And yet you represent that it is a subject with which the North has nothing to do; that any interference would be "foreign interference!" Why do you not admit, when you contend for the *domestic institutions (!)* of the South, that the General Government can do something?—and why do you not *urge* that the General Government *ought* to do something? Probably for the same reason that the last General Conference refused to recognize the sentiment that "we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery."

\* The italicising is mostly mine.



You know that slavery in the District of Columbia cannot be abolished without political or legislative action. And you know, also, that such action will not be likely to take place, till the community shall generally be brought to feel that slavery is a sin, and that it ought to be immediately abandoned. Now I ask, is it a crime for our senators and representatives to vote for the abolition of slavery in the District? Or is it a crime for the free states to send such men to Congress as will do this? What "constitutional provisions and publicly plighted faith" would be violated by *such action*? I ask you to point to the chapter and verse, if you are able. Do you even pretend that the abolitionists have ever intended any other political action! I presume not; for you quote Judge Jay, where he says, "Congress has no more right to sit in judgment on *southern* slavery, than it has to legislate on the abolition of slavery in France." And yet you say, "*any* political interference" will dissolve the Union!

I can very easily conceive how a hotspur of the South, or an unprincipled politician of the North, might misrepresent and abuse us; but how *you* can do it, and do it too *repeatedly*, I am at a loss to understand. I am unwilling to either suppose you are *ignorant* of the things you affirm, or that you *knowingly* misrepresent and abuse us; and yet, one or the other must be the fact.

As friends to the cause of suffering and bleeding humanity, we feel it to be our duty to adopt all the constitutional and lawful means in our power, to restore to the down-trodden slave his rights. We have the right to discuss the question of *southern* slavery; and we have a right, both by moral and political action, to labor to bring about its speedy termination, so far as our General Government has jurisdiction of the subject. The abolitionists have not and will not organize any separate political party. They will, however, give their support, so far as the election of senators and representatives to Congress is concerned, to *that party* and *those men* who will favor the cause of human rights.—Is there any thing unconstitutional or wrong in this? You know there is not. How then can you talk of violating

"constitutional provisions and publicly plighted faith," by such a course?

#### MORAL BEARINGS.

But you represent, that "when once this is made a question at the polls, *the moral bearings will be lost sight of.*" Was it not made a question at the polls in England? and were the moral bearings lost sight of there? Did not the Wesleyan Conference, *in a conference capacity*, recommend to their people to give their suffrages *only* to such men as would pledge themselves to vote for the abolition of slavery? and did they lose sight of the moral bearings of the question? Read their resolutions and doings, as recorded in the life of Richard Watson who himself took a lively interest in the great question of abolition, both as a moral and political duty. Are the politics of a *Christian country* so diverse from religion, that the moral and political bearings of the great question of human rights cannot both be kept before the community at the same time? Inasmuch as slavery in the District of Columbia can only be abolished by political or legislative action, is it impossible for abolitionists, who believe slavery to be a *great sin* as well as a political wrong, to support such men for Congress as will vote for the abolition of slavery, without losing sight of the moral bearings of the question? Or, rather, would they not lose sight of its moral bearings, if they were to take a different course? Could they be under the influence of enlightened religious principles, believing slavery to be a sin that ought to be immediately abandoned, and still give their influence to send such men to Congress, as would lay their petitions on the table without reading, or perhaps, reject them altogether? From such a system of ethics and politics, good Lord deliver us!

It is not a little strange that *you*, who have so often had this political hobby thrown in your teeth, in your temperance movements, should mount the same hobby yourself, with respect to another great moral question! How many times have you had to answer that stale objection, in your temperance lectures, "O it's a political thing?" Temperance discussions and measures have, in some

instances, led to political or legislative action; but is that an objection to such discussions? When the churches take right ground on any great national evil, it will, as a matter of course, produce an influence, upon the country. And do you wish to have *church and state at war* with each other? Or is it a crime for *Christians* to take an interest in the welfare of the country?

#### A LITTLE AMUSING.

Your remarks about a division of the Union are rather amusing. You seem very much in the southern interests. You appear to know not only what the South would *dare* to do, but also what she would be *inclined* to do; and that she would "*dare to do any thing she is inclined to do*"; and there is nothing she would be more inclined to do, than to separate herself from the northern States, the moment," &c. This is very chivalrous!

Suppose an anti-slavery lecture were appointed at Middletown, and you and others should say, publicly and privately, "the citizens of Middletown *dare* to do any thing they are *inclined* to do; and there is nothing they would be more inclined to do, than to mob an abolitionist, the moment he attempts to deliver a lecture in this city." Would that be the way to have a *peaceable meeting*? If the Union is ever divided on the slave question, the anti-abolitionists of the North will be principally responsible for that division. And you, my dear brother, will have your *full share* in that responsibility! It is our opponents in the North that are goading on the South to a division of the Union. And what is their object? Not indeed to divide the Union, but to *intimidate the abolitionists*. This however they cannot do; though their attempts to do it, *may* raise a storm which it will not be easy to quell. I do not however believe that our opponents in the North can work the South up into a phrenzy, that will induce them to divide the Union.

Let all the free states without a dissenting voice, say to the South, "divide the Union as quick as you please, if you have any thing to gain by it; we have not much to lose; we can take care of ourselves; and if you choose, we are willing to be released from our

obligation to help you in quelling your insurrections."

#### SOUTHERN THREATS.

Let the whole North take this course, and we shall hear no more about a division of the Union. The South knows how to threaten, and good men and bad men in the North know how to echo and re-echo their threats. Southerners boast that they can rule us with their threats. The Richmond (Va.) Whig has lately come out with the doctrine, that "the South united in herself *is always safe*, and CAN ALWAYS COMMAND!" Your address fully corroborates this doctrine. But has it indeed come to this! Can southern "*despots*" make slaves of the white inhabitants of the North so easy? It was not so thirty years ago. Then southern threats were received by the North with *just indignation*.

When the bill passed in Congress in 1807, making the foreign slave trade piracy, Mr. J. Randolph "declared, that if the law went into force as it was, he doubted whether we should ever see another southern delegate on that floor. He, for one, would say, if the constitution is thus to be violated, let us secede and go home."

Mr. Smilie said, "the gentleman (Mr. R.) talked of the southern states seceding from the Union. If they do not like the Union, let them say so—in the name of God, let them go—WE CAN DO WITHOUT THEM."—*Newport Mercury*, March 14, 1807.

But the law went into force, and the representatives and senators have appeared every year upon the floor of Congress, to repeat the same silly threat about "going home," and dissolving the Union.

Had our senators and representatives in Congress, from the free states, adopted Mr. Smilie's course, for the last two or three years, and had our editors, and presidents of colleges, followed their example, the South would, ere this, have been as tame as a "whipt spaniel." But suppose Mr. Smilie and others, in 1807, had said, "the South *dare* to do any thing she is *inclined* to do; and there is nothing she would be more inclined to do," than to divide the Union, if this bill goes into force. I need not tell you

what the effect would probably have been.

#### PROFIT AND LOSS.

What have the South to gain by a division of the Union? Perhaps, you will say, *their will*. Then let them know that they will not punish *us* by having their will. Can you make yourself believe that the South will lay open a *thousand miles* of her slave holding territory to the free States *with the Union divided*? Will she give her slaves such facilities for escaping from bondage? Will five of the slave holding States be willing to border on the free when the North becomes a separate government? No fugitives could be delivered up then! No slave State would be willing to border on the free States, if the Union were divided.

Can the Southern States make themselves believe that they could stop this discussion by dividing the Union? or that their slaves would, *in any sense*, be more secure than they are now? They have the right to legislate upon southern slavery *now*, and they could have no more *then*. Their safety now consists in their Union with the North, and will *they* cut that cord? Can they support a war upon the abolitionists with an army of slaves? Or can they, in addition to dispensing with northern support, maintain a war upon the North with their white men, leaving their women and children in the hands of their slaves at home? Would they have no fears that, in case of a division of the Union and a civil war, the North might hoist the standard of freedom, and offer the slaves *immediate emancipation*? The South will have a few things to consider before they will do any thing more than threaten. There will be some to raise the warning voice, even in the hot beds of slavery.

We are for preserving the Union; hence we oppose slavery, which must sooner or later destroy it, *if it is permitted to exist*. We consider the continuance of slavery a *paramount evil*; no fears, therefore, that the South will divide the Union, in consequence of this discussion, will deter us in our course. We shall not turn aside from the *plain path of duty*, through a fear of possible

*consequences*! To such a principle of expediency we cannot subscribe. We have not so learned Christ.

If the South divide the Union, because we pursue a constitutional and lawful course,—a course sanctioned by reason, Scripture, and our republican institutions,—why, then, they must divide it—that's all.\* If the Union is either to be dissolved, or cemented or kept together by slavery and the blood of souls, no patriot, philanthropist, or Christian, should hesitate a moment which alternative to choose.

We cannot certainly tell, beforehand, whether a division of the Union would be for good or for evil. We fear that bad consequences would grow out of it, and therefore we wish to preserve it; but *we may preserve it at too great a price*, and not preserve it *long*, after all. We will not become slaves ourselves, to preserve the Union. We shall hold on to the rights of *free discussion* and *liberty of conscience*, *whatever be the consequences*! Won't you, Br. Fisk?

Is it not assuming too much, to suppose that the Almighty could not overrule, even a division of the Union, for the *general good*? It is always *safe* to do *right*; men and devils, and wicked laws, to the contrary notwithstanding.

#### FALSE PROPHECY.

*You will recollect that on the eve of your departure to Europe, you quoted, with APPROBATION, in your farewell letter, a PROPHECY, that, if the abolitionists went on, "THE UNION WOULD BE DIVIDED WITHIN EIGHTEEN MONTHS!"* It has been more than eighteen months, and, strange to tell, the Union still ex-

\* The following sensible remarks are from the pen of Rev. S. J. May: "They may secede from the Union, but this will give them no relief. They will be just as near to God, just as near to the abolitionists. They must secede from the earth: nay, they must dissolve the moral government of the universe, before they can escape the necessity of meeting, openly and fairly, the great question of liberty and slavery. They cannot arrest the discussion, nor arrest its issue, which must be fatal to slavery."

—"Guided by our country's laws,  
For truth, and right, and suffering man,  
Be ours to strive in freedom's cause  
As Christians may, as freemen can!  
Still pouring on unwilling ears  
That truth oppression only fears."

ists! So much for the prophecy of your correspondent, *endorsed by yourself*.

How can you talk about *theft* and *robbery*, or, as Mr. Wesley calls it, "the sum of all villainies," and for which, says Dr. Clarke, "perdition itself has scarcely an adequate place of punishment," as among the *social* and *political* RIGHTS of *any people*? And, above all, how can you declare that this system of *soul murder* is "guarantied" to the South, "by the solemnities of CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, and publicly plighted FAITH?" I ask, *how* can you do this? But you are not a pro-slavery man! *O no!*

Slavery "*guarantied*" in a republican and Christian country, "by CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS!!" And this is *the Union* you labor so hard to preserve! But *what* are these "constitutional provisions?" and *where* are they? I deny that such provisions *exist*; and *you* should know better than to make such an assertion. They are not, of course, in the Declaration of Independence.

#### WHERE ARE THE "GUARANTIES?"

I have the old articles of confederation, adopted by the American Colonies, in 1777, and slavery is not even *indirectly* referred to in those articles. The Union was originally formed under these articles. Our present Constitution was adopted in 1788, ten or twelve years afterwards. And I deny that there is any thing that has even the *semblance* of a "guaranty" for domestic slavery in that instrument. That it indirectly recognizes the *existence* of slavery, is admitted; though neither the term *slave* or *slavery* is in the Constitution. But this is a very different thing from *guaranteeing* the "*right*" to enslave human beings "by constitutional provisions."

It may perhaps be admitted, that the Constitution does not *directly* prohibit slavery; and yet there is one expression in the Constitution that can scarcely be reconciled with such an admission, viz.: "*No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.*" Now, if slavery deprives *persons* of life, liberty or property, without due process of law, it comes, I should

judge, pretty near a violation of the Constitution! Will you have the goodness to show how slavery can be reconciled with this provision of the Constitution:

I will also here call upon you to show, that the Constitution of the United States *guaranties* in the *slightest degree*, the *right* of one portion of the citizens of this country to enslave another portion, whether they be white or colored! I have read the Constitution a few times, and I know what it contains; I therefore throw out this challenge with *confidence*. I know very well *what kind* of a case you can make out; still it appears to me you ought to *try* to prove your assertion, that "social and political rights" to enslave human beings, are "*guarantied*" to the South, "by the solemnities of constitutional provisions, and publicly plighted faith," or *retract the sentiment*. Such unsupported accusations can be considered only in the light of slander upon the CONSTITUTION and its VENERABLE FRAMERS.

#### GEORGE THOMPSON.

After representing "*any political interference of ours,*" "to all intents and purposes," a "*foreign interference,*" by a very easy transition, you bring your powers to bear upon that "*foreign emissary,*" GEORGE THOMPSON. The page or two of abuse which you heap upon his head I shall not notice at present. The reception which that gentleman has met with in England, since his return to that country, from many of the most distinguished men in the kingdom, among whom may be recorded Dr. WARDLAW, of Glasgow, *is far from proving him bankrupt in character!* Your late tour to Europe has probably satisfied you that Mr. Thompson's character is not quite so bankrupt there as has been represented. It has been found that he possesses weight of character enough to stand up with that champion for *good slave holders*, R. J. BRECKENRIDGE, before an intelligent British audience, for five successive evenings, to discuss American slavery, though in this country, this same Breckenridge would probably have thought such a "*bankrupt*" unworthy of notice.

## THE CONTRAST.

In was stated in the first part of this work, that the spirit of slavery has increased in our country for the last fifty years, both in Church and State, in proportion to the increase of slaves, to say the least. In that connection I examined the matter in relation to one branch of the Christian Church. I propose now to take a brief view of the subject in relation to the country at large. And here my limits will only allow a few pages, where I might write a volume. I will first give the sentiments of a few eminent divines and statesmen, to show where we stood fifty years ago; and, secondly, by the same means will attempt to show where we stand *now*.

## SENTIMENTS OF DIVINES.

*Testimony of Rev. Jonathan Edwards.*

Extract from a sermon preached at New Haven, Conn. Sept. 15, 1791.

"He who holds a slave, continues to deprive him of that liberty, which was taken from him on the coast of Africa. And if it were wrong to deprive him of it in the first instance, why not in the second? If this be true, no man has a better right to *retain* his negro in slavery, than he had to take him from his native African shores. And every man who cannot show that his negro hath by his voluntary conduct forfeited his liberty, is obligated *immediately* to manumit him.

"To hold a slave, who has a right to his liberty, is not only a *real* crime, but a very *great* one. I presume it will not be denied, that to commit theft or robbery every day of a man's life, is as great a sin as to commit fornication in one instance. But to steal a man or to rob him of his liberty, is a greater sin, than to steal his property, or to take it by violence. And to hold a man in a state of slavery, who has a right to his liberty, *is to be every day guilty of robbing him of his liberty, or of MANSTEALING*. The consequence is inevitable, that other things being the same, to hold a *negro* slave, unless he have forfeited his liberty, is a *greater sin* in the sight of God, than concubinage or fornication.

"Does this conclusion seem strange to any of you? Let me entreat you to weigh it candidly before you reject it. You will not deny, that liberty is more valuable than property; and that it is a greater sin to deprive a man of his whole liberty during life, than to deprive him of his whole property: or that man stealing is a greater crime than robbery. Nor will you deny, that to hold in slavery a man who was *stolen*, is substantially the same crime as to steal him. These principles being undeniable, I leave it to yourselves to draw the plain and necessary consequence.

"To convince yourselves that your information being the same, to hold a negro slave is a greater sin than fornication, theft or robbery, you need only bring the matter home to your-

selves. I am willing to appeal to your own consciences, whether you would not judge it to be a greater sin for a man to hold you or your child during life in such slavery as that of the negroes, than for him to indulge in one instance of licentious conduct, or in one instance to steal or rob? Let conscience speak, and I will submit to its decision.

"But, methinks, I hear some say,—I have bought my negro; I have paid a large sum for him. I cannot lose this sum, and therefore I cannot manumit him. Alas! this is hitting the nail on the head. This brings into view the true cause, which makes it so difficult to convince men of what is right in this case.

"You may plead, that you use your slave well—you are not cruel to him, but feed and clothe him comfortably, &c. Still every day you rob him of a most valuable and important right. And a highwayman, who robs a man of his money in the most easy and complaisant manner, is still a robber; and murder may be effected in a manner the least cruel and tormenting—still it is murder."

*Rev. Samuel Hopkins.*

In 1776, the celebrated Dr. Hopkins, then at the head of New England divines, published a pamphlet, entitled "An address to the owners of negro slaves in the American colonies," from which the following is an extract:—

"SLAVERY is, in every instance, wrong, unrighteous, and oppressive—A VERY GREAT AND CRYING SIN—there being nothing of the kind equal to it on the face of the earth."

*Presbyterian General Assembly.*

In 1794, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church adopted the following:—

"1 Tim. i. 10. The law is made for man-stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment. Exodus xxi. 16. And the apostle here classes them with *sinners of the first rank*. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it. *Stealers of men* are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and keep, sell, or buy them."

[The above was left out of their Catechism in 1816.]

The sentiments of Methodist clergymen, and conferences, thirty, forty, and fifty years ago, are given in full in the first part of this Appeal.

## SENTIMENTS OF STATESMEN.

*Thomas Jefferson, in 1782.*

"The commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions,—the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. Can the liberties of the nation be thought secure, when we have refused the only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people, that these liberties are the gift of God; that they are not to be violated without his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country, when I reflect that God is just—that his jus-

tice cannot sleep forever—that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means only, a revolution in the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation is among possible events; that is, may become probable by a supernatural interference. The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in such a contest.”

In 1814, he wrote thus:—“My sentiments on the subject of the slavery of the negroes have long been in possession of the public, and time has only given them stronger root. Yet the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time. *It will come*; and, whether brought on by the generous energy of our own minds, or by the bloody process of St. Domingo, is a leaf of our history not yet turned over.”

*Patrick Henry.*

“Is it not amazing, that at a time when the rights of humanity are defined with precision, in a country above all others fond of liberty—that in such an age, and in such a country, we find men professing a religion the most humane and gentle, adopting a principle as repugnant to humanity, as it is inconsistent with the Bible, and destructive to liberty? Believe me, I honor the Quakers for their noble efforts to abolish slavery. Every thinking honest man rejects it in speculation; yet how few in practice, from conscientious motives. Would any man believe that I am master of *slaves* of my own purchase? I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living without them. I will not, I cannot justify it. For however culpable my conduct, I will so far pay my devoir to virtue, as to own the excellence and rectitude of her precepts, and to lament my own want of conformity to them.”

*Mr. Wirt.*

“Slavery is contrary to the laws of nature and of nations. That slavery is an evil, and a transcendent evil, it would be more than idle for any human being to doubt or deny.”

*Samuel Adams.*

“His principles on the subject of human rights, carried him far beyond the narrow limits which many loud asserters of *their own liberty* have prescribed to themselves, to the recognition of this right in every human being. One day the wife of Mr. Adams returning home, informed her husband that a friend had made her a present of a female slave. Mr. Adams replied, in a firm, decided manner, ‘She may come, but not as a slave; for a slave cannot live in my house. If she comes, she must come free.’ She came, and took up her free abode with the family of this great champion of American liberty, and there she continued free, and there she died free.”—*Rev. Mr. Allen of Uxbridge, Mass.*

*Horatio Gates.*

“A few days ago, passed through this town, the Hon. General Gates and lady, on their way to take possession of their new and elegant seat on the banks of the East river. The General, previous to leaving Virginia, summoned his numerous family and slaves about him, and amidst their tears of affection and gratitude, gave them their freedom; and what is still better, made provision that their liberty should

be a blessing to them.”—*Baltimore paper, Sept. 8, 1790.*

*Rev. E. Stiles, 1781.*

“Slavery is unjust in its nature.”

*Hon. John Jay.*

“In the preamble of an instrument, by which Mr. Jay emancipated a slave in 1784, is the following passage:—‘Whereas, the children of men are by nature equally free, and cannot, without injustice, be either reduced to or held in slavery.’”

“In his letter while Minister at Spain, in 1786, he says, speaking of the abolition of slavery:—‘Till America comes into this measure, her prayers to heaven will be importunate.’”

*William Pinkney.*

“The celebrated William Pinkney, in a speech before the Maryland House of Delegates, in 1789, on the emancipation of slaves, said, ‘Sir, by the eternal principles of natural justice, no master in the State has a right to hold his slave in bondage for a single hour.’”

*United States Gazette.*

A writer in the Gazette of the United States, Feb. 20th, 1790 (then the Government paper), who opposes the abolition of slavery, and avows himself a slaveholder, says, “I have seen in the papers accounts of large associations, and applications to Government for the *abolition of slavery*. Religion, humanity, and the generosity natural to a free people, are the noble principles which dictate those measures. Such motives command respect, and are above any eulogium words can bestow.”

*Dr. Rush.*

“In 1794, Dr. Rush declared: ‘Domestic slavery is repugnant to the principles of Christianity. It prostrates every benevolent and just principle of action in the human heart. It is rebellion against the authority of a common Father. It is a practical denial of the extent and efficacy of the death of a common Saviour. It is an usurpation of the prerogative of the great Sovereign of the universe, who has solemnly claimed an exclusive property in the souls of men.’”

*Mr. Fiske.*

“In 1795, Mr. Fiske, then an officer of Dartmouth College, afterward a Judge in Tennessee, said, in an oration published that year, speaking of slaves: ‘I steadfastly maintain, that we must bring them to an *equal standing, in point of privileges, with the whites!* They must enjoy all the rights belonging to human nature.’”

*Hon. Benjamin Watkins Leigh.*

“Hon. Benjamin Watkins Leigh, late United States senator from Virginia, in his letters to the people of Virginia, in 1832, signed Appomattox, p. 43, says: ‘I thought, till very lately, that it was known to every body that during the Revolution, and for many years after, the *abolition of slavery* was a favorite topic with many of our ablest statesmen, who entertained, with respect, all the schemes which wisdom or ingenuity could suggest for accomplishing the object. Mr. Wythe, to the day of his death,

was for a simple abolition, considering the objection to color as founded in prejudice."

Roger Sherman.

"The celebrated Roger Sherman, one of the committee of five appointed to draft the Declaration of Independence, and also a member of the convention that formed the United States' constitution, said, in the first Congress after its adoption: 'The Constitution does not consider these persons, (slaves,) as a species of property.'"—[Lloyd's Cong. Reg. v. 1, p. 313.]

It may be proper here to remark, that abolition societies are not of recent origin. Several large State societies were formed, *fifty years ago*.

"In 1785, the New York Manumission Society was formed. John Jay was chosen its first President, and held the office five years. *Alexander Hamilton* was its second President, and after holding the office one year, resigned upon his removal to Philadelphia as Secretary of the United States Treasury. In 1787, the Pennsylvania Abolition Society was formed. Benjamin Franklin, warm from the discussions of the convention that formed the United States Constitution, was chosen President, and Benjamin Rush, Secretary—both signers of the Declaration of Independence. In 1789, the Maryland Abolition Society was formed. Among its officers were Samuel Chace, Judge of the United States Supreme Court, and Luther Martin, a member of the convention that formed the United States Constitution. In 1790, the Connecticut Abolition Society was formed. The first President was Rev. Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College, and the Secretary, Simon Baldwin, (the late Judge Baldwin of New Haven.)

"The same year the Virginia Abolition Society was formed. This Society, and the Maryland Society, had auxiliaries in different parts of those States. Both societies sent up memorials to Congress.

"About the same time a Society was formed in New Jersey. It had an acting committee of five members in each county in the State. The following is an extract from the preamble to its constitution:

"It is our boast, that we live under a government founded on principles of justice and reason, wherein *life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*, are recognized as the universal rights of men; and whilst we are anxious to preserve these rights to ourselves, and transmit them inviolate, to our posterity, we *abhor that inconsistent, illiberal, and interested policy, which withholds those rights from an unfortunate and degraded class of our fellow creatures.*

"Among other distinguished individuals who were efficient officers of these Abolition Societies, and delegates from their respective State societies, at the annual meetings of the American convention for promoting the abolition of slavery, were Hon. Uriah Tracy, United States Senator, from Connecticut; Hon. Zephaniah Swift, Chief Justice of the same State; Hon. Cesar A. Rodney, Attorney General of the United States; Hon. James A. Bayard, United States Senator, from Delaware; Governor Bloomfield, of New Jersey; Hon. Wm. Rawle, the late venerable head of the Philadelphia bar;

Dr. Casper Wistar, of Philadelphia; Messrs. Foster and Tillinghast, of Rhode Island; Messrs. Ridgely, Buchanan, and Wilkinson, of Maryland; and Messrs. Pleasants, McLean, and Anthony, of Virginia."

From the above it appears that six state societies were formed between 1785 and 1790. This was soon after the Revolution, and about the time the United States Constitution was adopted. The *spirit of liberty* was in the country in those days. These societies sent up from time to time, their memorials to Congress, which were respectfully considered; for *republicanism* was not then a mere name! I have only room for a short extract from three of them.

These extracts will show what sentiments were entertained on the subject of slavery by the fathers of our free institutions.

The following is an extract from a memorial to Congress, presented in February, 1790, by Dr. Franklin, as president of the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, which embraced many of the most distinguished and venerated men of that day, and among them several who were members of the convention which adopted the Constitution.

"That mankind are all formed by the same Almighty Being, alike objects of his care, and equally designed for the enjoyment of happiness, the Christian religion teaches us to believe; and the political creed of Americans fully coincides with the position. Your memorialists, particularly engaged in attending to the distresses arising from slavery, believe it to be their *indispensable duty* to present this subject to your notice. They have observed with real satisfaction that *many important and salutary powers* are vested in you, 'for promoting the welfare and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States;' and as they conceive that these blessings ought rightfully to be administered, *without distinction of color*, to all descriptions of people, so they indulge themselves in the pleasing expectation that nothing which can be done for the relief of the unhappy objects of their care will be either omitted or delayed.

"From a persuasion that *equal liberty* was originally the portion, and is still the *birth-right of ALL MEN*; and influenced by the strong ties of humanity and the principles of their institution, your memorialists conceive themselves bound to use all justifiable endeavors to loosen the bands of slavery, and promote a general enjoyment of the blessings of freedom. Under these impressions they earnestly entreat your serious attention to the subject of slavery; that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men, who alone, in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage, and who, amidst

the general joy of surrounding freedom, are groaning in servile subjection; that you will promote mercy and justice towards this distressed race, and that you will *step to the very verge of the power vested in you for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow men.*"

(Signed) BENJAMIN FRANKLIN, Pres.

This memorial was presented to Congress before the District of Columbia was made the seat of the General Government, and about two years after the United States Constitution was adopted. The ten miles square was accepted by Congress the next July. Dr. Rush and Judge Jay were among the signers to this memorial. These signers, some of whom participated in the debates of the convention which adopted the Constitution, could see "many important and salutary powers" vested in Congress, "for the discouraging of every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow men, and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States;" and that too, before there was any District of Columbia in existence! No one pretended then that all right to interfere in this business was guaranteed to the South! This wonderful discovery was reserved to modern times. No one, either North or South, pretended, forty or fifty years ago, that the North had no right to interfere with this question. So far from this, that some of the very men who were present when the famous "compromise" was made, went immediately to interfering in this business; and no one said, Why do ye so?

The memorial from the "Virginia Society," is equally explicit in its condemnation of slavery,—

"That your memorialists, fully believing that 'righteousness exalteth a nation,' and that slavery is not only an odious degradation, but an OUTRAGEOUS VIOLATION of one of the most ESSENTIAL RIGHTS of HUMAN NATURE, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the Gospel, which breathes 'peace on earth, good will to men;' they lament that a practice, so inconsistent with true policy and the inalienable rights of men, should subsist in so enlightened an age, and among a people professing that all mankind are, by nature, equally entitled to freedom."

In 1791, the Connecticut Abolition Society sent a memorial to Congress, from which the following is an extract:

"From a sober conviction of the unrighteousness of slavery, your petitioners have long beheld, with grief, our fellow men doomed to

perpetual bondage, in a country which boasts of her freedom. Your petitioners are fully of opinion, that calm reflection will at last convince the world, that the whole system of African slavery is unjust in its nature—impolitic in its principles—and, in its consequences, ruinous to the industry and enterprise of the citizens of these States. From a conviction of these truths, your petitioners were led, by motives, we conceive, of general philanthropy, to associate ourselves for the protection and assistance of this unfortunate part of our fellow men; and, though this Society has been lately established, it has now become generally extensive through this state, and, we fully believe, embraces, on this subject, the sentiments of a large majority of its citizens."

Had Miss Crandall established her school in Canterbury fifty years ago, it would not have called forth a legislative act to suppress it. The spirit of liberty dwelt in the land of steady habits in those days.

It was evidently the expectation of the framers of the Constitution, that slavery would not long be continued in our country. They undoubtedly supposed that the abolition of the *slave trade*, in 1808, would be the death warrant of slavery.

"In the Massachusetts Congress, of '88, Judge Dawes said, 'Although slavery is not smitten by an *apoplexy*, yet it has received a mortal wound, and will die of consumption.'—[*Deb. Ms. Con. p. 60.*] Gen. Heath said that, 'Slavery was confined to the states *now existing*; it could not be extended. By their ordinance, Congress had declared that the new States should be republican States, and have no slavery.'—[p. 147.]

"Mr. Tucker, of Virginia, Judge of the Supreme Court of that State, and professor of law in the University of William and Mary, addressed a letter to the General Assembly of that state, in 1796, urging the abolition of slavery, from which the following is an extract. Speaking of the slaves in Virginia, he says: 'Should we not, at the time of the revolution, have loosed their chains, and broken their fetters; or, if the difficulties and dangers of such an experiment prohibited the attempt, during the convulsions of a revolution, is it not our duty to embrace the first moment of constitutional health and vigor to effectuate so desirable an object, and to remove from us a stigma with which our enemies will never fail to upbraid us, nor consciences to reproach us?'"

"In the debates in the North Carolina Convention, Mr. Iredell, afterwards a Judge of the United States' Supreme Court, said, 'When the entire abolition of slavery takes place, it will be an event which must be pleasing to every generous mind, and every friend of human nature.' Mr. Galloway said, 'I wish to see this abominable trade put an end to. I apprehend the clause (touching the slave trade) means to bring forward manumission.' Luther Martin, of Md. a member of the convention that formed the United States Constitution, said, 'We ought



to authorize the General Government to make such regulations as shall be thought most advantageous for the *gradual abolition of slavery*; and the *emancipation of the slaves* which are already in the States."

"In the debate, May 13th, 1739, on the petition of the Society of Friends respecting the slave trade, Mr. Parker, of Virginia, said, 'He hoped Congress would do all that lay in their power to *restore to human nature its inherent privileges*, and if possible, wipe off the stigma, which America labored under.'"

"The following extract from a speech made in the convention that formed the constitution of Kentucky, in 1780, by a member of it, Mr. Rice, a native Virginian, is a specimen of the *free discussion* that prevailed on that 'delicate subject.' Said Mr. Rice, 'I do a man greater injury, when I deprive him of his liberty, than when I deprive him of his property. It is in vain for me to plead that I have the sanction of law; for this makes the injury the greater; it arms the community against him, and makes his case desperate. The owners of such slaves then, are *licensed robbers*, and not the just proprietors of what they claim. Freeing them is not depriving them of property, but *restoring it to the right owner*. In America, a slave is a standing monument of the tyranny and inconsistency of human governments. The master is the enemy of the slave; he *has made open war upon him*, and is *DAILY CARRYING IT ON* in unremitting efforts. Can any one imagine, then, that the slave is indebted to his master, and bound to serve him? Whence can the obligation arise? What is it founded upon?—What is my duty to an enemy that is carrying on war against me? I do not deny, but in some circumstances, it is the duty of the slave to serve; but it is a duty he owes to himself, and not his master."

The above sentiments were mostly expressed by speakers who were debating the question in different State Conventions, whether the Constitution of the United States should be ratified. They clearly show, that *general emancipation* was anticipated in all parts of the country, at no distant period.

Now let us look at the present state of things in our country, and see whether the spirit of liberty has not indeed progressed backwards. Look at the present sentiments of statesmen and divines, and say if there be not cause of alarm.

#### SENTIMENTS FAVORABLE TO THE PERPETUITY OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

Governor McDuffie.

"Domestic slavery, therefore, instead of being a political evil, is the corner stone of our republican edifice. No patriot who justly estimates our privileges, will tolerate the idea of emancipation, at any period, however remote, or on any conditions of pecuniary advantage, however favorable. I would as soon think of opening a negotiation for selling the liberty of

the state at once, as for making any stipulation for the ultimate emancipation of our slaves.—So deep is my conviction on this subject, that if I were doomed to die immediately after recording these sentiments, I could say in all sincerity, and under all the sanction of Christianity and patriotism, God forbid that my descendants, in the remotest generations, should live in any other than a community having the *institution of domestic slavery*."

#### Testimony of the Columbia, S. C. Telescope.

"Let us declare, through the public journals of our country, that the question of slavery is not, and shall not be open to discussion—that the system is deep rooted among us, and *must remain forever*: that the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture us upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out and cast upon a dung hill.

#### Testimony of the Washington Telegraph.

"As a man, a Christian, and a citizen, we believe that slavery is right; that the condition of the slave, as it now exists in slave holding states, is the best existing organization of civil society.

#### Testimony of Dr. R. Furman, Baptist.

"The right of holding slaves is clearly established in the Holy Scriptures, both by precept and example.—*Exposition of the views of the Baptists, addressed to the Governor of S. Carolina*, 1833.

#### Testimony of the Charleston Courier.

"We protest against the assumption—the unwarrantable assumption—that slavery is *ultimately* to be extirpated from the Southern States. *Ultimate* abolitionists are enemies of the South, the same in kind, and only less in degree, than *immediate* abolitionists."

#### Testimony of the Rev. R. N. Anderson.

"To the Sessions of the Presbyterian Congregations within the bounds of the West Hanover Presbytery:

"You are aware that our clergy, whether with or without reason, are more suspected by the public than are the clergy of other denominations. Now, dear Christian brethren, I humbly express it as my earnest wish, that you quit yourselves like men. If there be any stray goat of a minister among us, tainted with the bloodhound principles of abolitionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to dispose of him in other respects. Your affectionate brother in the Lord. 1835. "ROBERT N. ANDERSON."

#### Testimony of Prof. Hodge.

"The assumption that slave holding is, in itself, a crime, is not only an error, but it is an error fraught with evil consequences"—*Bib. Rep. April 1836*.

#### Testimony of Dr. Dalcho, of S. Carolina.

"Slavery is not forbidden by the Divine law, so it is left to our own judgment whether we hold slaves or not."—*Practical Considerations, &c.* 1823.

*Testimony of the Augusta, Geo. Chronicle.*

"He [Amos Dresser] should have been hung up as high as Haman, to rot upon the gibbet, until the wind whistled through his bones. The cry of the whole South should be, **DEATH, INSTANT DEATH** to the abolitionist, *wherever he is caught*. **HANG** every emissary that dare step a lawless foot upon our soil—cut off all trade with every Northern house connected with them."

*Testimony from Camden, S. C.*

"The following resolution was passed at a meeting of the citizens of Camden, S. C., in 1834:

"*Resolved*, That slavery, as it exists with us, *we deny to be an evil*—and that we regard those who are now making war upon it, in any shape, or under any pretext, as furious fanatics or knaves and hypocrites; and we hereby promise them, upon all occasions which may put them in our power, the fate of the *pirate*, the *incendiary*, and the *midnight assassin*."

*Testimony of W. B. Seabrook, of S. C.*

"In the judgment of my fellow citizens, slavery is *not inconsistent with the laws of nature, and of God*. The Bible informs us, that it was established and sanctioned by Divine authority even among the elect of heaven."—*Essay read before the Agricultural Society of St. John's Collection, 1836.*

*Testimony of Rev. N. Bangs.*

"The man, however, who will deliberately deny that the Jews held **SLAVES**, denominated bond men and bond maids, such as were bought and sold with money, deserves not a serious refutation, *as there is no truth in the Bible more plain and undeniable.*

*Testimony of Mr. Preston, of S. C.*

Mr. Preston said, in a speech in the Senate of the United States, in January 1835, "Let an abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina, and, if we can catch him, we will try him; and, notwithstanding all the interference of all the governments of the earth, *including this Federal Government*, **WE WILL HANG HIM!**" No Northern senator rebuked the wretch!

*Testimony of Congress.*

The House of Representatives of the United States, on the 18th Jan. 1837, adopted a resolution in the words following, to wit:

"*Resolved*, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating in any way or to any extent whatever to the subject of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

"In House of Representatives, Dec. 21, 1837: *Resolved*, That all petitions, memorials, and papers, touching the abolition of slavery, or the buying, selling or transferring of slave in any State, district or territory of the United States, be laid upon the table without being debated, printed, read or referred, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon."

Under the last resolution, petitions signed by about 500,000 names have been "laid on the table, without being *debated, printed, read or referred!*" It was not so in the days of Jefferson, Franklin, Rush, Jay, and others of our revolutionary patriots! These infamous resolutions could not have passed but for *Northern votes*. Some fifty Northern representatives were found so recreant to the principles of our free institutions, as to vote for the latter resolution—(and a larger number for the former)—nearly twenty dodging the question, and not voting at all!

WHAT ARE WE COMING TO?

Look at the manner in which most of the legislatures in the free States have disposed of petitions praying for jury trials, where persons are claimed as fugitives from slavery. Look at the anti-abolition resolutions which they have passed, and the messages of many of their Governors. Look at the mobs to put down the discussion of slavery, headed in some instances by judges and members of Congress, and which have destroyed both *property* and *life*—these robbers and murderers being still permitted to roam at large. Look at the "framing of iniquity by law," to destroy schools for colored persons! And in another State, a school-house is removed into a swamp! And all this in States nominally free.

Look at the refusal of the Presbyterian General Assembly to entertain the question of slavery in their deliberations. Look at the doings of the last General Conference of the M. E. Church—the doings of her bishops—the doings of anti-abolition conferences—the defence of slave holding from the Bible, by Bishop Heddington and President Fisk—in a word, look through the whole country; examine both Church and State, compare the present with the past, and then say whether the spirit of slavery is not indeed striking its roots deeper and deeper in every part of the land, and whether we have not something to do in the North, in relation to this subject! To me it appears evident, that our country is on the brink of ruin, and that if we do not awake and repent, the thunderbolts of the Almighty will soon be hurled down upon our guilty heads.

The whole mass is corrupt. Theft and robbery of the worst kind are practiced with impunity. And those who are laboring to save the Church and the country are called "knaves," "hypocrites," "incendiaries," "fanatics," "schismatics," and every thing else that is vile!

While blackness is gathering in the heavens, and the thunders are rolling and the lightnings flashing; while the bow of justice is drawn, and the arrow is made sharp for its victim; while the sword of God's vengeance is made bare, and destruction is coming upon the land—our statesmen and doctors of divinity can fold their hands, and calmly say, "Keep still; it is a very delicate question." And then, the "peace of the Church!" It is nothing to them that two and a half millions of American citizens are groaning in chains! "They are not their brother's keeper." *Opposition to sin is a dreadful thing; but sin itself is a small matter, compared with "agitation!"* What a paradox we are, to surrounding nations—and what a stench in the nostrils of the Almighty! I blush for our institutions; I blush for our religion!

#### REV. HUBBARD WINSLOW.

A sermon by the Rev. Hubbard Winslow of Boston, which has been recently published, clearly shows, that we are "degenerate plants of a strange vine." In it we look for the spirit of the pilgrims, or the patriotism of our fathers, in vain. A Methodist physician in the same city has publicly endorsed his sentiments, so far at least as slavery and abolitionism are concerned, and has caused that part of his sermon to be published in *Zion's Herald*. Among the many anti-republican, time-serving, and erroneous statements found in that discourse, I can only notice two or three.

His definition of "republican liberty" is one of the greatest curiosities of the age. I have seen but one public endorser of the definition, and that is Dr. A. B. Snow, of Boston. He says Mr. Winslow's definition of "republican liberty" "*is a perfectly correct one;*" which is as follows:

#### REPUBLICAN LIBERTY.

"*Liberty to do and say what the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood will allow and protect.*"

Let us try this rule. Jesus Christ and the apostles were robbed and crucified, because they preached doctrines, which the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood would not allow and protect. The Wesleys were frequently mobbed, because they preached doctrines, which the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood, of the church of which they were members, would not allow and protect. Our fathers were shot down on Bunker Hill, Concord, Lexington, and other places, because they dared to resist the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood. The Protestants have been butchered by the Papists, for uttering sentiments which the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood would not allow and protect. Thirty ladies were mobbed, and a gentleman was led through the streets, in Boston, with a halter round his neck, by "5000 gentlemen of property and standing" in 1835, because they dared to promulgate the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence—doctrines which the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood would not allow and protect, *though they were fully protected by the laws.* The Quakers were put to death, and Lovejoy was murdered for the same reason. And all this, it would seem "*is perfectly correct!!*" Spirit of '76, where hast thou fled? and where is the mantle of WESLEY? O time serving, compromising generation!

Suppose five years hence "the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood," should mob Mr. Winslow for putting forth such definitions of "republican liberty!" Would he not think it very hard, that liberty of speech should be denied him, in a land where it is secured to every person by the laws? If he did, he might be informed, that this is the "natural result of a republican form of government." Deliver me from republicanism then, I think the clergyman would reply.

Is not this definition of republican liberty, one of the most outrageous and corrupt sentiments ever uttered by man? O no, it is replied, "*it is perfectly correct!*" No wonder that mobs fill the

land, when divines will utter such sentiments, and Doctors endorse them!

It is more than intimated, that our inability to suppress riots, is the want of a standing army. But suppose we had ever so many armies; the prevailing voice and will of the *brotherhood*, may be the prevailing voice and will of the *army*—and what then? Mr. Winslow knows that every mob in the land, might have been *prevented, or suppressed immediately*, if the civil authorities had used promptly the power put into their hands. And why have they not done this? Because such men as Rev. H. Winslow and Dr. A. B. Snow, have opposed *abolitionism*, more than they have *mobs*—because they have represented abolitionists as the *cause* of the mobs—because they have represented mobs as the “natural consequence of a republican form of government,”—and because they have not come out upon *recreant magistrates*!

Where did the sentiment come from, that “republican liberty is liberty to say and do what the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood will allow and protect?” We ought to look for it in the Bible, as it is announced by a Protestant divine. Go back to the ages of absolute despotism. Look at Daniel, when he kneeled down and prayed three times a day, contrary to the law of the king; and the three Hebrew children, when in the plains of Dura, they refused to fall down and worship the golden image—did they act on the principle that the “prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood” is to be the rule of all our conduct?

Some may be ready to say that the apostles enjoined obedience to the “powers that be.” But the sentiments contained in the sermon refer not to the laws, but to the authority that the majority of the “brotherhood” may at any time please to set up. But to test the question, whether this is the doctrine of the apostles, we must apply it to their own conduct and feelings. “You must not preach in the name of Jesus,” say the *brotherhood*. “Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than God, judge ye.”

I cannot find Mr. Winslow’s doctrine in the Bible. But, did that divine get it from the Declaration of Independence? What does that say? “All men are

created equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” Liberty to do what! Our fathers did not think to tell us that they meant, “liberty to do what the prevailing voice and will of the brotherhood will allow and protect.” But did he get this sentiment from the Constitution of the United States? That instrument was formed to establish justice, and to secure the blessings of *liberty, not slavery*. It expressly guaranties the right of speech and the freedom of the press. It guaranties this even to propagate the most *unpopular doctrines*. Again, did this doctrine come from the Constitution of Massachusetts? That contains similar guaranties. Did it come from any statute of Massachusetts? Did it come from any statute of any state? No, it cannot be found, even among the slave laws.

Well, did this doctrine come from *slave holders*? I am not clear of that fact. If slave holders admit that doctrine, a majority in the slave states would claim that 250,000 should not rule 2,000,000. This little minority govern thirteen states—they rule our Congress, and spread an awe and dread all over our country. They surely would not be very willing to admit this doctrine.

But where did it come from? It came from *expediency*. It is that cringing, time-serving spirit, which would favor nothing that is unpopular. *It is modern dastardly expediency*. The doctrine contained in that sermon, that abolitionists are responsible for all the tumults that follow the propagation of their doctrines—that Lovejoy was responsible for the mob that resulted in his own murder—will make every moral reformer, from the Saviour and the apostles down to the present time, responsible for all the opposition they encounter. The Protestant reformers were, on this principle, responsible for all the blood shed by Queen Mary, and all the persecution awakened by their preaching. According to that sermon, no moral reform is to be commenced, till the majority are reformed. So says not the Constitution. The humblest individual may commence the reform, in the obscurest corner, and our Constitution protects him. A worse sentiment I recollect

never to have met with! It is so *insidious*. What if McDuffie tells us we have no right to speak? We all know better. What if mobs say we must not do this or that? We all know, *they are mobs*. What if some corrupt political journals have proscribed us—we know the motives which govern them. But, when the pulpit becomes recreant to its high trusts, there is cause of alarm!

#### ALL THE NORTH OPPOSED TO SLAVERY.

Mr. Winslow says again, "*the great body of the people at the North, almost or quite to a man, are sincerely, truly, and earnestly for the abolition of slavery! and they have ever been so.*" The author of this sweeping statement, does not attempt to sustain it by any *facts*; and though it appears to be stereotyped in the vocabulary of our opponents, it stands as a mere naked, unqualified assertion. I will, however, endeavor to supply the Rev. H. Winslow's lack of service, by furnishing a few *facts* to sustain this position.

1. The fact, that all petitions and memorials praying Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and the Territories are laid on the table without reading, and that by the votes of northern members, is, certainly, evidence that the North are all *right*—and the fact also, that slavery has existed for *fifty years*, under the jurisdiction of the General Government, is evidence how *sincerely, truly, and earnestly*, the whole "North, almost or quite to a man, are for the abolition of slavery, and always have been."

2. The mobs which have been got up, composed too, sometimes, of "gentlemen of property and standing," to put down all discussion of the slave question, shows how *sincerely, truly, and earnestly* the North wish for abolition. Does Rev. Mr. Winslow [or Dr. Snow] know any thing of the *fact*, that about 5000 patriots, in a certain city, not many years ago, paraded the streets, and broke up a meeting of *thirty ladies*, when our glorious Union was in such imminent danger from their operations, while they were opposing slavery, which all the "North so *sincerely truly and earnestly*" wish to have abolished?

And have not the inhabitants of a small city in one of the free States, recently shown their great anxiety to get rid of slavery, by shedding the blood of a faithful man of God, because he would oppose it? Who can doubt the truth of Mr. Winslow's statement. To show how much in point these facts are, I will illustrate their bearing by a simile. Suppose the Rev. Mr. Winslow should affirm that the whole country, with perhaps the exception of *drunkards, rum-makers, and rum-sellers*, were in favor of temperance; would it not be good evidence of the truth of his statement, to have the first temperance lecturer that comes along *mobbed*; not by those who make, sell, or drink rum, but by the great body of temperance people? Suppose it should be said that the great body of the people are opposed to licentiousness, and to prove it, the moral reform lecturer is *mobbed*, and forsooth, there is no power in the civil authority to suppress the mob? Now this is precisely the evidence we give in the North, that we are all for the abolition of slavery.

The numerous anti-abolition meetings which have been got up, the refusal of State Legislatures to give persons claimed as fugitive slaves a *jury trial*, and their refusal to express any sentiment against slavery, or to instruct their senators, and request their representatives in Congress to vote for the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, are all *additional evidences, how sincerely* in the free States, we desire the "abolition of slavery."

3. The fact that scores and hundreds are every year going from the free States to the South, and becoming *slave holders*, among whom are professed Christians, and Christian ministers—proves very clearly, how "*sincerely, truly and earnestly*" we all desire the "abolition of slavery" in the North. Suppose a person who cannot get any intoxicating drinks, should make his boast how strong he is on the temperance question; yet as soon as he can get where rum is, he gets drunk. This is the practical evidence he gives of his strong temperance principles. And this is precisely the evidence we give, that we are all opposed to slavery in the North. Opposed to slavery where we cannot hold slaves;

but many of our citizens become *slave holders*, as soon as they get where the laws will permit them to do so. If we were all opposed to slavery in the North, *as we ought to be*, our citizens would no more go to the South and *hold slaves*, than they would go there and *steal horses*.

4. Another evidence that we are all opposed to slavery in the free States, is, that those ministers and church members whom Mr. Wesley says are "exactly on a level with men stealers," and for whom Dr. Clarke says, "perdition has scarcely an adequate place of punishment," are cordially admitted to our pulpits and communion tables! and Mr. Winslow, with all his 'abhorrence of slavery,' considers it very improper to exclude them. He stands "aloof" from such measures; they are altogether too "ultra" for him.

5. The fifth evidence which I will name, that the "great body of the people at the North, almost or quite to a man, sincerely, truly, and earnestly desire the abolition of slavery," is, that the *only class* who are doing *any thing* for its abolition, are represented as worse than mobs—being "mental" mobocrats themselves, and exciting all the mobs in the country.

6. The majority of the people in the North say ten times as much against the *abolitionists*, as they do against *slavery*. This shows how truly and earnestly the great body of the people at the North, almost or quite to a man, desire the abolition of slavery.

7. The great body of the people at the North are ten times as sensitive about hard language, when applied to *slavery* and *slave holders*, as they are when it is applied to any other sins or sinners. And it would seem from their practice, that they consider it almost a virtue to use hard language when they speak of the *abolitionists*.

These are my reasons, or some of them, for believing that "*the great body of the people at the North, almost or quite to a man, sincerely, truly and earnestly desire the abolition of slavery.*"

If they do not satisfy my brethren of the truth of Mr. Winslow's statement, it is not my fault; they are the best I can give.

## WESLEYAN METHODISTS.

It is well known, that our brethren in England took the lead in the great anti-slavery battle which was fought in Europe previous to West India emancipation. RICHARD WATSON stood in the front rank, and led on, under God, the moral forces of the Methodist Church, to glorious victory! The testimony of Wesleyan missionaries is thought to have turned the scale in favor of emancipation, at the time the bill passed in the British parliament. More petitions were sent to Parliament by the Wesleyan Methodists, than by any other denomination. Petitions, we are told, from their congregations alone, contained, in a single year, 250,000 names!

Now let us look at Wesleyan Methodism, from the days of John Wesley to the present time, and see if it has not indeed "held one undeviating language" in relation to slavery.

### Testimony of John Wesley.

To slave holders. "This equally concerns all *slave holders*, of WHATEVER RANK AND DEGREE: seeing men buyers are exactly on a level with MEN STEALERS!

"The blood of thy brother crieth against thee from the earth.' O, whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry before it be too late; INSTANTLY, at any price, were it the half of your goods, *deliver thyself from blood-guiltiness!* Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house, and thy lands, at present are stained with blood. Surely it is enough—accumulate no more guilt—spill no more the blood of the innocent. Do not hire another to shed blood; do not pay him for doing it. Whether you are a *Christian* or not, show yourself a MAN! Be not more savage than a lion or a bear.

"Perhaps you will say, 'I do not buy any slaves; I only use those left by my father.'—But is that enough to satisfy your conscience? Had your father, have you, has any man living a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting revelation aside. Neither war nor contract can give any man such a property in another as he has in his sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible that any child of man should be born a slave. LIBERTY is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature. If, therefore, you have any regard to justice, to say nothing of mercy, or of the revealed law of God, render unto all their due. Give liberty to whom liberty is due, to every child of man, to every partaker of human nature. Let none serve you but by his own act and deed, by his own voluntary choice. Away with all whips, all chains, all compulsion! Be gentle toward all men, and see that you invariably do unto every one, as you would he should do unto you."

A larger extract from Mr. Wesley, will be found in another place.

*Testimony of Dr. Clarke.*

"In heathen countries, slavery was in some sort excusable; among Christians, it is an *exorbitancy* and a *crime*, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate state of punishment."

Again he says—"I here register my testimony against the unprincipled, inhuman, anti-Christian, and diabolic *slave trade*—with all its authors, promoters, abettors, and sacrilegious gains; as well as against the great devil, the father of it and them."

*Testimony of Richard Watson.*

"If it is wrong to steal men from Africa—to reduce them to a state of bondage—it is, for the same reason, to *retain them in slavery*. If you condemn the *first thief*, and the *first receiver* of the stolen goods, how will you justify those who, *knowing them to be stolen, continue to retain them*. I confess that I cannot see how the perpetuation of an injury can cause it to cease to be an injury; or by what process an acknowledged wrong can be transmuted into a right, by continuing in it. My argument then is, if it was wrong to enslave the negroes, it is wrong to keep them in hopeless bondage; and it follows, that, after this country had renounced the African slave trade, it was bound by the *very principles* on which that wretched traffic was repudiated, to have taken measures for the liberation of all who had thus been wickedly reduced to a state of captivity, at the earliest period at which their liberation could have been made consistent with their own interests, and long before this time to have converted them into a free, industrious, and happy peasantry."

"Slavery is a national *violence* and *theft*—an oppressive, a debasing, a relentless and a *murderous* bondage."

"Why should we *gradually* cease to sin, where sin is in fact acknowledged?"

Mr. Wesley denominated the Anti-Slavery Society a "*truly patriotic and Christian Society*."

The following extracts are from an address by Mr. Watson, which is found in his *Life*, by Thomas Jackson.

"Slavery was man stealing in its origin; and with this vicious origin it remains tainted to this day. It would be as hopeless a task to wash it off, as to wash the Ethiop white. Characterized as a crime against God and man, the thin gauze of sophistry cannot conceal its hateful aspect; and the attempt to find a palliation for it in the Old Testament, only makes more audible those thunders which are launched against it, as one of the most odious crimes both in the law and in the Gospel."

"But the advocates of slavery take us to the New Testament as well as to the Old. I am sure we can have no objection to follow them. \* \* \* It is indeed surprising enough, that, with the fact before them, that *Christianity has abolished slavery* in all the ancient countries where it obtained predominant influence, that any persons should dream that, in its earliest periods, when it glowed with all that warmth of charity with which it burst from the

fountain of the Divine compassion, it should enter into any alliance with it. To hold property in men is a thing agreeable enough to human nature, as we have proof in the present day: it flatters man's pride, it gratifies his love of power, to see his fellow creatures tremble before him, and to be the absolute lord of their life and happiness."

"They tell us that the apostles did not command pagan governments to loose their slaves; and they take shelter here, as though they could plead this black privilege of pagan despotism; but we hold them to their profession: they profess Christianity; therefore they must be tried by its laws; and by one of these laws we are content that the whole question of the consonancy of Christianity with slavery shall be tried: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, so do ye also unto them.'"

"St. Paul sets freedom before the Christian slave as a good, after which he ought to aspire by all lawful means: 'If thou mayest be free, choose it rather.' I believe this language would have conducted him to a jail in Jamaica—but it is his language; and it proves that he regarded slavery as an evil, and liberty as a good to be sought by every Christian slave. If the apostle were a friend to slavery, why did he thus exhort the slaves? And if he thus urges them to seek their liberty, then in vain do our scripture-quoting slave holders plead apostolical authority."

*Testimony of the Wesleyan Conference.*

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1830, *Resolved*, "That, as a body of Christian ministers, they feel themselves called upon again to record their solemn judgment, that the holding of human beings in a state of slavery is *in direct opposition* to all the principles of natural rights and to the benign spirit of the religion of Christ."

"That the Conference fully concur in those strong moral views of the *evil of slavery* which are taken by their fellow Christians of different denominations; and that they express their sympathy with an injured portion of their race, and their abhorrence of all those principles on which it is attempted to defend the subjection of human beings to hopeless and interminable slavery."

"That the Conference still farther recommend, in the strongest manner, to such of the members of the Methodist societies as enjoy the elective franchise, that, in this great crisis, when the question is, whether justice and humanity shall triumph over oppression and cruelty, or nearly a million of our fellow men, many of whom are also our fellow Christians, shall remain excluded from the rights of humanity, and the privileges of that constitution under which they are born; they will use that solemn trust to promote the rescue of our country from the guilt and dishonor which have been brought upon it by a criminal connivance at the oppressions which have so long existed in its colonies, and that, in the elections now on the eve of taking place, they will give their influence and votes only to those candidates who PLEDGE THEMSELVES to support, in parliament, the most effectual measures for the entire abolition of slavery throughout the colonies of the British empire."

The Wesleyan Conference, it seems, could have conference action on slavery, though they could exercise no "legislative, executive, or judicial" authority in relation to its abolition. They do not appear to have been so much afraid of *politics*, as some of our brethren affect to be. They could pass a resolution requesting their members to exert a *political influence*. But what a terrible thing it would be, for our General or Annual Conferences to do this! *And yet our General Government stands in precisely the relation to slavery in the District of Columbia and the territories, and the slave trade between the States, that the British Parliament did to slavery in the West Indies!*

#### WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN 1835.

An extract from the Address of the Methodist Wesleyan Conference in England, to the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States.

"It has already to come to your knowledge as a matter of public notoriety, that by the blessing of God on the efforts and influences of our connexion, and on the *combined endeavors of the religious public* of our beloved country, a great measure for the emancipation of the slaves in all the territories of Great Britain, was eventually conducted to a successful issue in the Imperial Legislature; and has since been carried into practical effect in all the colonies of the empire, with various degrees of completeness, but universally with **SAFETY AND ADVANTAGE**, and with results which mightily encourage us to go forward in our earnest attempts to enlighten and evangelize the whole population, to which favorable access is thus freely opened. Our American brethren will doubtless allow us the fraternal liberty to express our conviction that **GREAT SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES** are *opposed to the continuance of slavery in a Christian state*; that the permission of it is one of those deviations from natural equity and evangelical purity which call for *further deviations* to abet and maintain them; that it is contrary to the precepts of Christianity, and violates and counteracts the principles and obligations by which the Gospel urges those precepts. We trust that your connexion having *already begun* to resist and condemn this baneful system, will, in its own way, be freely and providentially led to such practical steps as shall produce a consensaneous opinion, feeling and purpose among your own people; and will then have the *glory* of leading the *public opinion* of your great and increasing population, to such decided views as will result in a unanimous rejection of *slavery* and its social mischiefs, on the ground of its *repugnance* to the *laws of Christ*."

The address from which the above is an extract, the General Conference *refused to publish!* Shame on American

Methodism! In the answer to this address, which was adopted by the General Conference, some dissatisfaction was manifested, in relation to the above paragraph. Our Wesleyan brethren so understood it. They have replied to the answer of the General Conference, and the following is an extract from their reply.

#### WESLEYAN CONFERENCE IN 1836.

"We regret that the allusion in our epistle of last year, to the subject of slavery, should have occasioned you either pain or embarrassment.

"Into the details of any measures of emancipation we did not enter; but in conformity with our well known sentiments, we intended to affirm the principle, that *slavery is a system of oppressive evil, and is in direct opposition to the spirit of our divine religion*; and we hoped that the time had arrived when our beloved sister connexion in America would be prepared to *act on these sentiments*, and receive our suffrages with approving cordiality. *Slavery in itself*, is so obviously opposed to the *immutable principles of justice*, to the *inalienable rights of man* of whatever color or condition, to the social and civil improvement and happiness of the human family, to the *principles and precepts of Christianity*, and to the full accomplishment of the merciful designs of the Gospel, that we cannot but consider it the *duty of the Christian church to bear an unequivocal testimony against a system which involves so much sin against God*, and so much oppression and wrong, inflicted on an unoffending race of our fellow men.

"In common with others, the Wesleyan Conference, and generally the people of their charge, took this course during the discussion of the question of emancipation in our own beloved country. The *force of Christian principle*, peaceably, but *firmly maintained*, and legitimately urged, has *overcome every difficulty*. The black and colored population of our own colonies have entered into a state of freedom; and the inestimable advantages of religious liberty have been secured on the basis of an equal toleration. The Conference has the means of knowing that the blessing of God, has been graciously vouchsafed to this act of national justice, in the extension of the Gospel, in the conversion of great numbers of the negroes, and in the improved state of society in the colonies.

"As it must always be the duty of Christian ministers and churches, not only to embody the principles of their holy religion in the formularies of doctrines and codes of discipline, but also to *act upon them*, the Wesleyan Conference of this country trust that their American brethren may be enabled, by the *constant arousal* of the great principles of emancipation, to direct and *urge forward* their people to unite in the truly Christian enterprise of conferring on the slave population of the United States the inestimable benefits of civil and religious freedom.

"In assuming the right of mildly, but firmly pressing such sentiments on public attention,



the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America cannot, any more than ourselves, be chargeable with an inconsistent zeal.

"But in addition to these inferior considerations, the Conference cannot but avow its conviction, that in *all cases* it is *most safe*, and in the end *most advantageous*, that Christian churches should act on the principle of *religious obligation and duty*. And although it deeply deplors that the Methodists of the United States should be exposed to inconvenience, obloquy, or danger, by the assertion of right sentiments on this subject; yet as the evil of slavery *does exist there*—as they are brought into immediate contact with it—as they are called, in the order of divine Providence, to maintain their long published and scriptural testimony against it, even in the midst of this state of things—and as the progress of events renders it *impossible* even if it were *lawful*, that they should be *NEUTRAL*—the British Conference trusts that it will not be considered as in any way exceeding the privileges of the fraternal relation existing between the two parties, when it expresses its anxious and earnest hope that our American brethren will feel it their duty, in union with other Christians, to *ADOPT SUCH MEASURES AS MAY LEAD TO THE SAFE AND SPEEDY EMANCIPATION OF THE WHOLE SLAVE POPULATION OF their great and interesting country.*"

On the above, the Christian Guardian, a Methodist paper published in Canada, remarks:

"Happy will it be for the American Methodist Church, and for the country which she has so much contributed to bless, should the admonitions and advices contained in this admirable document be duly regarded by her influential leaders, so far, at least, as to induce them to *cease from their opposition to those of their brethren who are engaged in that noble and philanthropic cause—the abolition of slavery.* It is with the most kindly feelings that we express our deep conviction that the cause of Negro Emancipation *must and will prevail*, and our ardent desire that *METHODISM IN AMERICA*—which, in every period of her existence, has been forward to engage vigorously in every good work—should at once bend her energies to this, one of the most laudable which has ever claimed her aid. *Many of her ministers and members have already closed their ears to the siren song of expediency*, and are viewing the subject in its *proper light*—as a *great moral question*; and they have come to the right conclusion that *nothing can justify the continuance of a sinful practice, or cancel the responsibility under which the Church of Christ is laid, to labor for its extinction.*"

TESTIMONY OF REV. JABEZ BUNTING.

The following sentiment was expressed by Mr. Bunting, President of the Wesleyan Conference, in 1836. It was expressed in the Conference, in reply to Rev. W. Fisk.

"Slavery is *always wrong*—ESSEN-

TIAL,LY, ETERNALLY, and INCURABLY WRONG. DIE IT MUST; and happy should I have been, had they [the General Conference of the M. E. Church] PASSED SENTENCE OF DEATH UPON IT!"

Such has been Wesleyan Methodism from the *beginning*; and such was American Methodism *once*. But alas! What is it *now*?

The following extract from a letter dated Sept. 28, 1836, and written by a minister now filling one of the most important stations in the New England Conference, gives too true a description of modern Methodism.

"What was done at the General Conference, and what has issued from the CHAIR at our late Conference, and the determined spirit of persecution among the anti-abolitionists, among my brethren, are matters that greatly afflict me. What to do, I know not. The great body of the Methodists, and especially Methodist ministers, have left me, and if they have not taken Methodism with them, I am a Methodist still.—I cling to WESLEY, COKE, WATSON, and CLARKE, to the BRITISH CONFERENCE, to the OLD AMERICAN CONFERENCES, to the DISCIPLINE and the BIBLE.

If what is now called Methodism is Methodism, it is "*modern*" Methodism. Ancient Methodism was not a *nose of wax*, a *creature of circumstances*, a thing that could be accommodated to every call, *sin not excepted*! No; its principles are founded in the eternal relation of things, and the immutable word of God."

We have a strong attachment to the pure principles of Wesleyan Methodism; and never stronger, than at present. But with the practice of modern American Methodism, so far as the slavery question is concerned, we have no fellowship. Our present practice, *as a people*, is a total departure from the principles of Wesley, Wesleyan Methodism, Methodist discipline, and ancient Methodist usages in this country. But because we are trying to bring back the Church to her former *principles and practices*, we are "*schismatics*!" Let the candid judge, who have departed from the "*old ways*," and who are the *schismatics*!

#### PROSPECTS OF THE CAUSE.

Thanks be to God, that in the language of our British brethren, our "*connexion*" has "*already begun to resist and condemn this baneful system.*"

Three years ago, that is, the first of

January, 1835, it was not known that there were a dozen abolitionists in the Methodist Episcopal Church. About that time several of our ministers commenced the discussion of slavery in *Zion's Herald*; and within six months from that time, a majority of two annual conferences were abolitionized, the exertions of Br. Fisk, and the influence of the Counter Appeal to the contrary notwithstanding. These conferences numbered about one hundred and fifty ministers each. Had Bishop Hedding, Rev. W. Fisk, and Rev. N. Bangs espoused the cause in the commencement, the reform would, undoubtedly, have gone rapidly through the connection. There would have been but *one party* in the free states. Upon them, therefore, rests the responsibility of the doings of the last General Conference, and all the evils that have grown out of the measures of the anti-abolitionists, in the M. E. Church! And is not this an awful responsibility? In consequence of the opposition of our opponents, we have had to gain our ground by "*inches*." But notwithstanding this the cause, in our Church, has been steadily onward! A majority of six annual Conferences may now be considered as abolitionized; and in four of them a large majority—these are the New England, New Hampshire, Maine, Genesee, Black River, and Erie. The two latter were about equally divided at their last sessions. There are a large number of abolitionists in the Troy, Oneida, and Michigan Conferences; and not a few in the New York, Pittsburg and Ohio Conferences; and a number in other Conferences. There are now not less than *eight hundred travelling preachers* in the free States, who are abolitionists—perhaps nearer one thousand, which would make about one third of the whole connection, including the Southern Conferences. There are probably as large, or a larger number of local preachers who are with us, in connection with tens of thousands of our members. Abolitionism is now going forward in the M. E. Church with an increased momentum. We have three Methodist papers under a decided anti-slavery influence, and there is some reason to hope that a majority of the next General Conference will be abolitionists. The Conferences already abolitionized will send *nearly one third of the delegates*. Two thirds of the delegates will go from the free States. Should twelve out of the sixteen Conferences in the free States, be abolitionized before the next General Conference, it will give us a majority of *several delegates* in the General Conference. We can spare Philadelphia, New Jersey, Indiana, and Illinois Conferences to go with the South, and still have a majority in the next General Conference, providing all the other Conferences are abolitionized. In addition to what we now have, Troy, Oneida, Michigan, Pittsburg, Ohio, and New York, will make a majority of five or six delegates. Respecting Troy, Oneida, and Michigan, there is not much doubt. There is hope of Ohio, Pittsburg and New York. And we do not despair of even the other four Conferences, or enough out of the whole to constitute a majority in the next General Conference. There are some abolitionists, I believe, in all the Conferences in the free States—and moral reforms, be it remembered, never go backwards. Philadelphia and New Jersey will not perhaps be behind New York; and there are more abolitionists in the New York Conference, than our friends in the great city would be willing to have known, through the columns of the *Christian Advocate* and *Journal*!

But we have no concern, at present, with the next General Conference. We held to the faithful performance of duty, and to leaving the results with God. "Duty is ours, consequences are his." Whether we are in the *minority* or *majority*, we hope to stand erect for God's truth. We have no *party purposes* to serve—no object to accomplish, but the general good of our fellow men. We should indeed rejoice to have our next General Conference "pass sentence of death upon slavery." And if anti-slavery principles spread for two years to come, as they have done for two years past, there is little doubt but this will be done at Baltimore, in May, 1840.

Two of our annual Conferences within the last year have passed resolutions in opposition to the Baltimore Conference resolutions.

## PITTSBURG CONFERENCE.

The following preamble and resolution was passed, *nearly unanimously*, at the late session of the Pittsburg Conference, held at Steubenville, Ohio.

"Whereas the rule which prohibits 'the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them,' has recently been subjected to various constructions, not only differing from each other, but in the judgment of many of the ministers of our church, neutralizing the force and bearing of this plain and important rule: We, therefore consider it a privilege, and above all our bounden duty, to offer the following resolution as the sense of this conference respecting the rule in question:—

"Resolved, That in the judgment of this conference, **ALL TRAFFIC** in the souls and bodies of our fellow men, **UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES**, which either originates or PERPETUATES SLAVERY, is a *direct violation, both of the spirit and letter* of our general rule on this subject."

## GENESEE CONFERENCE.

The following resolutions were, I believe, passed *unanimously*, at the late session of the Genesee Conference, held at Perry, N. Y.

1st, That in the judgment of this Conference, our Discipline, in declaring that slavery is a "*great evil*," is to be understood as pronouncing, not upon its civil and political, so much as upon its *moral* character.

2d, That "the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention to enslave them," are terms that, in their obvious import, relate as well to the *internal*, as to the foreign traffic in human beings; so that the buying and selling of men, women and children, with an intention either to originate or *perpetuate* their enslavement, is a violation of the disciplinary interdict.

It is to be hoped that every Conference in the free States, will pass similar resolutions, before the next General Conference.

Preachers' anti-slavery societies have been formed in connection with seven of our annual Conferences, numbering in all, five or six hundred members!

Thus much in relation to the prospects of the cause, in the M. E. Church. In relation to its prospects in the country at large, I will give you an extract from a letter by Mr. Rhett, member of Congress from South Carolina, to his constituents. It is dated Jan. 15, 1838. Mr. Rhett, being a southern man, will not, of course, be suspected of exaggeration, in stating the prevalence of abolitionism.

## TESTIMONY OF MR. RHETT.

"A large body of citizens, consisting of *one hundred and fifty thousand*, organized into *one thousand five hundred societies*, increasing at the rate of *one a day*, with *boundless resources* and *ably conducted presses and agents*, and missionaries and martyrs, who pant for distinction in this holy cause, as the best proof of their virtue and sanctity, are permitted, in our sister States, to band together for the openly declared purpose of destroying our institutions. *Three years ago*, I am told, these societies were about *three hundred*; their numbers about *six thousand*; their petitions about *ten thousand*. Now they are *hundreds of thousands*; *control two States*; increasing in all the non-slaveholding States, and *feared by all*. United together upon but *one principle*, they throw their weight into the scale amongst the contending parties of the country, without uniting with any, so as to control the majority, and advance the great purpose of their organization. \* \* \*

"Throughout the northern states—*throughout the whole civilized world*—the feeling of condemnation of this institution may be said to be *universal*. Even in our sister States, those who forbear interfering upon this subject, from a regard to the constitutional compact or the Union, are *abolitionists in principle and feeling*. Although they do not approve of the unprincipled course of the abolitionists, they desire and hope to see slavery abolished; and if they had the power, or lay under the responsibility of its existence, they would destroy it in a day. Hence, they stand passively by and permit us to be assailed, approving of the end, although condemning the means; and the Union, which was designed to guaranty, or at least not to affect injuriously, our institutions, is perfidiously used for their overthrow. And mark the history of this fanaticism in foreign nations. Born in atheism, and baptized in the blood of revolutionary France, it accomplished its purpose there. In England, it has sprung up under the *guise of religion*, and it has accomplished its purpose there. *It has never yet failed, and never will fail*, in accomplishing its purpose, *where the slaveholder does not control his own destinies*. IT IS NOW FLAMING IN THE UNITED STATES, and extending its numbers with a rapidity *far surpassing the operation of the gospel itself*, in bringing converts to its cause. All efforts hitherto made for its suppression have only *fanned, instead of extinguishing the flame*. The people in some parts of the country, indignant at their open violation of their constitutional faith and the principles of the Union, rise up and crush them. The cry of persecution is raised, and *new converts crowd their ranks*. Congress, in the spirit of conciliation, in the vain hope of reconciling their demands with the powers of the Constitution, instead of rejecting, receive and act upon their petitions. The right of petition is said to be infringed, and a sovereign State of the confederacy demands that Congress shall rescind the rules by which their agitation is attempted to be suppressed. *The spirit of abolition has advanced, and is advancing. IT INCREASES BY OPPOSITION. IT TRIUMPHS BY DEFEAT!*"

## ABOLITIONISTS.

*Their principles.*

1st. We hold that Congress has no right to abolish slavery in the southern states.

2d. We hold that slavery can only be lawfully abolished by the legislatures of the several states in which it prevails, and that the exercise of any other than moral influence to induce such abolition, is unconstitutional.

3d. We believe that Congress has the same right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, that the state governments have within their respective jurisdictions, and that it is their duty to efface so foul a blot from the national escutcheon.

4th. We believe that American citizens have the right to express and publish their opinions of the constitutions, laws and institutions of any and every state and nation under Heaven; and we mean never to surrender the liberty of speech, of the press, or of conscience—blessings we have inherited from our fathers, and which we intend so far as we are able, to transmit unimpaired to our children.

5th. We have uniformly deprecated all forcible attempts on the part of the slaves to recover their liberty. And were it in our power to address them, we would exhort them to observe a quiet and peaceful demeanor, and would assure them that no insurrectionary movement on their part, would receive from us the slightest aid or countenance.

6th. We would deplore any servile insurrection, both on account of the calamities which would attend it, and on account of the occasion which it might furnish of increased severity and oppression.

7th. We are charged with sending incendiary publications to the South. If by the term *incendiary* is meant publications containing arguments and facts to prove slavery to be a moral and political evil and that duty and policy require its immediate abolition, the charge is true. But if this term is used to imply publications encouraging insurrection, and designed to excite the slaves to break their fetters, the charge is utterly and unequivocally false.

8th. We are accused of sending our publications to the slaves, and it is asserted that their tendency is to excite insurrections. Both the charges are false. These publications are not intended for the slaves, and were they able to read them, they would find in them no encouragement to insurrection.

9th. We are accused of employing agents in the slave states to distribute our publications. We have never had one such agent. We have sent no *packages* of our papers to any person in those States for distribution, except to five respectable resident citizens, at their own request. But we have sent, by mail, single papers addressed to public officers, editors of newspapers, clergymen and others. If, therefore, our object is to excite the slaves to insurrection, the *MASTERS* are our agents!

10th. We believe slavery to be sinful, injurious to this and every other country in which it prevails; we believe immediate emancipation to be the duty of every slaveholder, and that the immediate abolition of slavery, by those who have the right to abolish it, would be safe and wise. These opinions we have freely expressed, and we certainly have no intention to

refrain from expressing them in future, and urging them upon the conscience and hearts of our fellow-citizens who hold slaves or apologize for slavery.

11th. We believe that the education of the poor is required by duty, and by a regard for the permanency of our republican institutions. There are thousands and tens of thousands of our fellow-citizens, even in the free states, sunk in abject poverty, and who on account of their complexion, are virtually *kept* in ignorance, and whose instruction in certain cases is actually prohibited by law! We are anxious to protect the rights and to promote the virtue and happiness of the colored portion of our population, and on this account we have been charged with a design to encourage intermarriage between the whites and blacks. This charge has been repeatedly, and is again denied, while we repeat that the tendency of our sentiments is to put an end to the criminal amalgamation that prevails wherever slavery exists.

12th. We are accused of acts that tend to dissolution of the Union, and even of wishing to dissolve it. We have never "calculated the value of the Union," because we believe it to be inestimable; and that the abolition of slavery will remove the chief danger of its dissolution; and one of the many reasons why we cherish and will endeavor to preserve the Constitution is, that it restrains Congress from making any law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

Such, fellow citizens, are our principles.—Are they unworthy of republicans and of Christians?—*Ex. Com. of the A. An. Slavery Society, New York, Sept. 5, 1835.*

*Objects.*

The object of this Society is the entire abolition of slavery in the United States. While it admits that each state in which slavery exists, has, by the Constitution of the United States, the exclusive right to *legislate* in regard to its abolition in said state, it shall aim to convince all our fellow citizens, by arguments addressed to their understandings and consciences, that slaveholding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety, and best interests of all concerned, require its *immediate abandonment*, without expatriation. The Society will also endeavor, in a constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade, and to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country, which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia, and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any state that may be hereafter admitted to the Union.—*Constitution of the A. A. Slavery Society, Art. ii.*

This Society shall aim to elevate the character and condition of the people of color, by encouraging their intellectual, moral and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice, that thus they may, according to their intellectual and moral worth, share an equality with the whites, of civil and religious privileges; but this Society will never, in any way, countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force.—*Ibid, Art. iii.*

*Measures.*

1. To treat *all* men as *men*,—as immortal beings made in the image of the glorious God.

2. To pray for the enslavers and the enslaved.

3. To obtain and spread light upon the sin and evils of American slavery, by open, free, Christianlike discussion—by speaking the truth in love for all persons, and on all occasions.—[Manual.]

### METHODIST CONVENTION.

Declaration of sentiments adopted by the Convention at Lynn, Oct. 25, 1837.

Whereas, the Most High God has "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth;" and, whereas, we believe that "all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and, whereas, we believe that it "is impossible that any child of man should be born a slave; liberty being the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air, and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature;"

#### *Sin of Slavery.*

Therefore, we believe, That holding the human species as *property*, is a most FLAGRANT SIN, and that NO CIRCUMSTANCES can make it otherwise. We believe with Mr. WATSON, "That if it was wrong to steal men from Africa, and reduce them to a state of bondage, it is for the same reason, wrong to retain them in a state of slavery. If you condemn the *first thief*," says he, "and the first receiver of the stolen goods, how will you justify those who, *knowing them to be stolen, continue to retain them?*" He adds, "I confess I cannot see how the *perpetuation of an injury* can cause it to cease to be an injury, or by what process an acknowledged wrong can be transmuted into a right by continuing it. My argument then is, that if it was wrong to enslave the negroes, it is wrong to keep them in hopeless bondage; and it follows, that, after this country had renounced the African slave trade, it was bound by the very principles on which that wretched traffic was repudiated, to have taken measures for the liberation of all who had been thus wickedly reduced to a state of captivity, \* \* \* and long before this time to have converted them into a free, industrious, and happy peasantry."—*Watson's Life*, page 380.

And we believe with Mr. Wesley, "that men buyers," "of whatever rank and degree," "are exactly on a level with men stealers." It follows, we think, as a matter of course, from the above extracts, that the *perpetuation of SLAVERY is the highest kind of theft and robbery*—inasmuch as it robs its subjects, not of their wages only, but of their right to themselves also—invaluing the territories of nature and of nature's God, and stripping immortal spirits, made in the Divine image, of all their *natural rights*—thus reducing men to *things*, and making merchandize of those for whom Christ died.

#### *Immediate Emancipation.*

We believe that immediate emancipation, without expatriation, is the duty of the master, and the right of the slave.

### *Internal Slave Trade.*

We believe that the internal slave trade is no better in principle, and scarcely less horrible in practice, than the foreign traffic; and that the principles of patriotism and the Christian religion demand of our General Government the *immediate abolition of all traffic in human beings*, so far as its jurisdiction extends.

### *Slavery in the District of Columbia.*

The existence of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in the territories of this nation, we consider a disgrace to our republican institutions; it being a sin in which the whole nation is involved, and which makes all our boasted pretensions to liberty and equal rights, justly chargeable with the basest hypocrisy. And the manner in which petitions and memorials on the subject of slavery have been disposed of by the General Government, but too clearly indicates that we have something yet to do in the North!

### *The Sin of the Churches.*

We are of the opinion that the sin of American slavery, to an enormous extent, is the sin of the *Christian Churches*, both in the North and South—and that an awful responsibility is resting upon ministers of the Gospel, with respect to this great evil—and especially upon such as *hold slaves, or apologize for slavery under any circumstances!* We believe that the *professed* Christians of the South, together with their *apologists* in the North, are the *main supporters* of slavery—and that all northern Christians, who neglect to lift up the warning voice, and *refuse to take sides* with God's suffering poor, are *scarcely less guilty*.

If the way of emancipation is to be prepared, as we believe it is, by moral means, then it is under God in a great measure, for the churches to say, how long slavery shall be continued in our country. We cannot but believe, that the Christian pulpit is awfully guilty in this matter. Even in prayer, the manacled slave is entirely forgotten in many of the pulpits of this Christian land, while it is generally thrown open to clerical slaveholders, when they visit the free states. We seriously doubt whether it is consistent with Christian principles, and with a professed opposition to slavery as a *moral evil*, to invite those who make merchandize of God's image to our pulpits and our communion tables. And we here record our solemn judgment, that those ministers who neglect to preach against slavery as they do against other sins, do not declare the whole counsel of God. We believe that God's ministers not only *may*, but *ought* to oppose this system of *soul murder*, even on the SABBATH! Believing that the holier the day the better—and that if we are authorized to pull a beast out of a pit on the Sabbath, much more ought we to lift up the down-trodden of God on that holy day.

### *"Our Appropriate Work."*

Believing as we do, that slavery is one of the *greatest sins in all the land*, we cannot admit, that those who feel it their duty to devote themselves principally to writing and lecturing upon this "shocking abomination," have "left the Gospel to preach politics."

To plead the cause of the oppressed, we be-

lieve is the "*appropriate work*" of a minister of Christ—and that to preach against that oppression under which two and a half millions of Americans are groaning, is to preach at least one important feature of the Gospel, *in its purity*.

#### *Kind Treatment of Colored People.*

We believe that a very favorable and salutary influence may be exerted upon southern slavery, by kind treatment of the colored people at the North. When the slaveholder visits the free States, let him see that the colored people are treated with respect. We fear the *negro-hating spirit* is as prevalent in the North as in the South! Colored people are excluded from most of our colleges and academies—from our trades and professions; and from the inside of our steamboats and stage coaches. They are put into one corner of our churches, and are seldom permitted to sit either at the Lord's table, or at any other with the whites! *These things ought not so to be.* And these evils *must* be corrected.

We verily believe, that what is usually termed the *prejudice of color*, is nothing more or less, than **HATRED OF LOW CONDITION!!**

#### *The Measures—Hard Language.*

While we do not agree to endorse every thing which may have been written and said on the abolition side of this great question, we are nevertheless, of the opinion, that many things which have been thought *severe*, seem so, mainly, because they are **TRUE**—that many things which have been thought *personal*, personify *principles* not *men*—and that *plain truth* and *plain dealing* have frequently been mistaken for a *bad spirit*.

Principles are sometimes so indented with their advocates, that it is difficult to do justice to the former without *seeming* to be severe against the latter. Too great a sensitiveness on this subject appears to us, to evince either an *illiberal mind*, or a *bad cause*. And while on the one hand, we would exhort our brethren to *speak the truth in love*, on the other, we would entreat our friends not to make a man "*an offender for a word*."

From the days of Christ and the apostles to the present time, the principal actors in all moral reforms have been accused of using *hard language*. And whoever thinks to reform the world with *soft words* and *whisper tones*, will be sure to be disappointed. Our opponents, it seems, do not always practice upon that principle. The vocabulary of hard language is not confined to the abolitionists. This fact should not be forgotten.

#### *The Necessity of Union.*

It having been a long established principle, that "*union is strength*;" and abolitionists having to encounter a constant storm of opposition from their enemies, we deem it very injudicious for them to turn their weapons against each other. *And being well satisfied with our present anti-slavery organization*, we cannot but view with deep regret all movements *designed or calculated* to divide the anti-slavery ranks.

Though our *conference anti-slavery societies* are not auxiliary to any existing anti-slavery organizations, yet we do most cordially approve of

the *doctrines and measures* of the *American Anti-Slavery Society and its auxiliaries*; believing them well adapted to change and correct public sentiment upon the subject of slavery. And while we rejoice to find in the anti-slavery ranks men of all theological and political sentiments, we should exceedingly regret to see the holy cause of abolition assume either a *sectarian* or *party political aspect*—believing that it will be safer in the hands of abolitionists, *as such*, than in the hands of any *sect* or *party*, either in church or state—being well assured, that so far as the elective franchise is concerned, the principles of every true friend of the slave will lead him to give his support to such men as will carry out the *true spirit of our republican institutions*, with whatever party they may rank. And though we have no wish ever to see a "*church and state*" party in politics, yet it is our solemn conviction, that *Christians*, so far from standing aloof from all human governments, and denouncing all human institutions, should feel their responsibility as citizens; and should give their support only to men of good moral principle.

#### *Duties and Rights of Christians.*

We believe that all religious assemblies should bear their unequivocal testimony against slavery; and to question their right to do so, is to deny some of the plainest principles of moral philosophy and the Christian religion; as well as to adopt a *principle* contrary to all analogy and enlightened usage.

If a body of Christians have any rights, one of those rights must be, liberty to oppose all sin, either in their individual or associated capacity. And as these are rights which exist in the *very nature of things*, no man can take them from us.

#### *Free Discussion.*

Though we regret that there should exist any necessity for discussing the right of a body of Christian ministers to express a sentiment on the subject of slavery, yet, inasmuch as this is the *fact*, we believe it is not only proper, but *important*, that this subject should be fully discussed through the columns of our religious journals, that our people may understand it in all its bearings. We know of no good reason why these matters should be confined to the clergy, or why they should be kept from the church at large.

We wish, however, that it may be distinctly understood, that in all our discussions of the question of conference rights and the powers of bishops, it has been our constant aim to avoid any attack upon the episcopacy of our church *as such*, or upon any part of our church polity—our controversy having been with *certain principles of administration*, which we believe to be **UNAUTHORIZED BY THE DISCIPLINE!**

The above is a brief view of our *sentiments, objects, and measures*. What is there disorganizing in our doctrines? What is there unchristian in our objects? and what is there fanatical and incendiary in our *measures*?

## THE MEASURES.

Many will say, "O, we are all abolitionists, except the measures." Well, what is there about the "measures" that is improper? Is the monthly concert of prayer wrong? This is one of our measures. Is it wrong to attempt to enlighten the public mind through the press, and by public addresses? This is another of our measures. Is it wrong to attempt to change public opinion by means of voluntary associations? [If so, then the temperance measures are wrong.] This is another of our measures. Is it wrong to petition Congress to abolish slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia and the territories, and the slave trade between the States? Or to send our remonstrances to Congress against the admission of any new slave holding territory to the Union? To petition the State legislatures to instruct their senators, and request their representatives, in relation to these matters? These are the last of our measures. Now, what is there so dreadful in these peaceable and constitutional measures? Ought we not to be doing *something* to get rid of slavery? Are our opponents doing *any thing*? If they do not like *our* measures, ought they not to institute better ones? Can we be justified in doing nothing, while millions of our fellow citizens are groaning in bondage? I envy not that *man*, and especially that *minister*, either his *head* or his *heart*, who can oppose the only measures in operation for the liberation of the slaves, without opposing slavery, or engaging in any means for its abolition? No wonder such persons find it necessary to *proclaim* that they are as much opposed to slavery as we are, for nobody would ever find it out by their *conduct*. Wo be to the poor slaves, if their deliverance is to come from such persons! We will not blame our opponents for not embracing *our* measures, if they will do any thing themselves; but they do not attempt any thing, except to find fault with us. O what benevolence! What sympathy for the cause of bleeding humanity!

Suppose a man were drowning, and our opponents were looking on, and coolly saying, "It is a pity that he should drown—but we cannot help it." But an abolitionist rushes to the scene, and

without stopping to "calculate consequences" or to ascertain whether he can lay hold of the man without hurting him, he plunges into the water just as he is rising for the *last time*, seizes him by the *hair of his head*, and drags him to shore; but our opponents, standing on the bank, refuse to let him land with the drowning man, *because he uses such harsh measures!* This is precisely the position our opponents are now occupying in relation to the perishing slave—doing nothing themselves, and hindering those who are trying to rescue the innocent from the hand of the oppressor. "Lord, lay not this *sin* to their charge!"

## HARD LANGUAGE.

"O, but you use hard language." So did Christ and the apostles; so have the martyrs and reformers in all ages; instance Luther, Wesley, Fox, Whitefield, &c.

"Ye are of your father the devil," said Christ, "and the lusts of your father ye will do." And yet these very persons were *professors of religion!* What language! And to aggravate the matter still more, in other places they are denounced by the same Being, and that too in a truly "Christian spirit," as "hypocrites," and *whitewashed* "sepulchres!" How severe!

Again, "O full of all subtlety, thou enemy of all righteousness, thou child of the devil; wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" What! call men *children of the devil!* Why this is going beyond the abolitionists in severity and personalities. "But what they said was *true*." Indeed! and may we plead the *truth* in justification also? "But they were inspired." *Inspired* to do what it is *wicked* for us to do? Have moral principles so changed? "But they did not denounce slavery nor slave holders." Indeed! Then all kinds of wickedness and wicked men may be denounced except *slavery* and *slave holders!*

Mr. Wesley calls slave traders "African butchers," "men stealers," &c. and says, "All slave holders, of whatever rank or degree, [Christians and ministers *not* excepted] are exactly on a level with" these *butchers* and *men stealers*. "You," says he to the slave holders, speaking of the slave trade, "are guilty,

yea, *principally* guilty, of all these frands, robberies and murders. You are the *spring* that puts all the rest in *motion*—therefore the blood of all these wretches who die before their time, whether in their own country or elsewhere, *lies upon your head.* \* \* \* Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house, thy lands, are at present *stained with blood!* \* \* \* Be not more savage than a lion or a bear!" He pronounces the slave trade "complicated villany—robbery, and murder," and declares that ALL slave holders, of whatever rank and degree, are "*exactly* on a level" with this villany, robbery and murder, and are "*partakers with the thief!*" What "personal criminations and acrimonious epithets!" What a *mental* mobocrat—"equally accountable (says Dr. Snow) with the man who assaults his neighbor with brickbats and stones."

And Dr. Clarke too, is not a whit behind Mr. Wesley in *hard language*. "In heathen countries," said that great divine, "slavery was in some sort excusable; but among Christians it is an *enormity* and a *crime*, for which perdition has scarcely an adequate place of punishment." What! *perdition* almost too good a place for *Christian* slave holders?

Our opponents sometimes use a *little* hard language. A member of the New England Conference has been called, among other hard names, "*a child of the devil*" by a member of the South Carolina Conference. And has any of our opponents breathed a sentiment publicly against this transaction? A member of the N. H. Conference has been published to the world through the columns of the Christian Advocate and Journal, as a "*bitter reviler*;" and this was done by member of the New York Conference! No retraction has been called for *by any of our opponents*; and the author of that expression stated, not long since, through the columns of the Christian Advocate, that he still thinks he had good reason for making it.

A member of the last General Conference was wished *dead*, and two others were represented as being engaged in "*damning iniquity*," by a member of the Georgia Conference.

The 599th No. of the Christian Advocate and Journal contains a commu-

nication from one of the "respected correspondents" of that paper, headed with more than half a column of editorial, calling attention to the article, without disapproving of a single expression contained in it. From this article I take the following *mild expressions!* The writer complained of us for hard language, &c. Now see what an example he sets us. Abolitionists are called "Reckless—bewildered"—accused of being "disingenuous"—"sophistical"—making "attempts to dismember the republic"—guilty of an "*utter contempt* of public opinion," and a "total disregard of the counsel of the wise, the good," &c.—guilty of a "shameless manner"—of "besliming, begrimming, and besmattering the characters of those who have opposed their visionary schemes"—of having "villified eminent men"—making "mischievous statements"—uttering "calumnies"—making "groundless charges"—"snarling"—uttering "glaring falsehood"—guilty of "malice and cunning"—uttering "nefarious untruth"—"total falsity"—"nonsense"—"wanton falsehood"—"vile traduction"—"falsehood struck at the prolific mint of abolitionism." The above is a *mere sample* of columns of a similar description, which might be gathered from the communications of our opponents. What an example of *mildness and soft words!* Abolitionists must be dull scholars indeed if they do not learn to reprove mildly under such anti-abolition teaching!

In several late numbers of the Christian Advocate and Journal, Rev. N. Bangs has charged a member of the New England Conference, over and over again, with "*palpable falsehood*"—and that too, in relation to a matter which his conference had carefully investigated, and without administering *the least* censure, had passed a resolution, I believe *unanimously*, that his character for TRUTH and VERACITY stood FAIR and UNIMPEACHED! This accuser was present at the Conference which investigated the matter, and *knew* that the accused had been *honorably acquitted*? And yet he must continue to slander the innocent, by reiterating his charges of palpable falsehood! How *mild*,—how *brotherly!*

And have any of our opponents pub-



licly disapproved of such conduct? But it may be said, these good brethren would not have expressed themselves thus, had it not been for our exciting discussions. It may be answered, that neither Jesus Christ or the apostles would have been crucified, had it not been for their exciting communications. Wesley, and many other Methodist preachers, both in Europe and America, would not have been mobbed, had it not been for their *exciting* doctrines and measures.

The blame of all the hard language of our opponents, and of all the mobs in the land, is thrown upon the heads of the abolitionists; and *wherefore*? Is it because we have refrained from countenancing mobs and violence, and have pursued a peaceable, lawful, and constitutional course?

#### IS OUR LANGUAGE TRUE?

TRUTH is sometimes necessarily severe, and severe *because* it is TRUTH. The proper question to be decided is, whether our language is *true*, or not. If it be not true, it should be abandoned; but if it be, it remains to be proved, that it should not be used. What language have we ever used which is *untrue*? O, you have called slavery *theft* and *robbery*—and slave holders *thieves* and *robbers*! Well, is there any thing untrue in such a representation? If so, then the testimony of Mr. Wesley and the Declaration of Independence, is untrue. See pages 7 and 8 of this Appeal. See also the testimony of Jonathan Edwards and Richard Watson, in Part V. of the Appeal. See also the Bible: "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall be surely put to death." See pages 35th and 36th of the Appeal.

If slavery be a *sin*, and yet is not theft and robbery, I would like to know to what class of crimes it properly belongs? I believe it will be impossible to make it appear that slavery is not theft and robbery of the very worst kind—as much worse than horse stealing, as a man is more valuable than a brute—and as much worse than highway robbery, as human rights are more valuable than dollars and cents!!

Now as to the propriety of calling things by their right names, and of

speaking the truth plainly. All will admit, that there is no impropriety in designating horse stealing by its *proper name*, even though *Christians* (!) were to steal horses! No impropriety in calling robbery *robbery*, where money is concerned, though but 25 cents be taken, and that too by a *good* (!) man! But *man stealing* must not be designated by any hard names! O no, many of them are *Christians*, and become slave holders from "*principle*!" And "*deacons*, *elders* and *BISHOPS* should be SLAVE-HOLDERS," alias, MEN STEALERS!

I must be called a thief and a robber, if I take forcibly 25 cents from another, and my ministerial character will not shield me from this hard epithet; but I may rob another of his soul and body, and I am a *gentleman*! Do not call me a thief and a robber!

I once heard of a minister who told his people, "if they did not repent, they would go to a *place*, that he would not *name* before that *polite* congregation!" If such preaching is most likely to convert sinners, then may we hope to convert slave holders by "daubing them with untempered mortar." But till we can be convinced of that fact, we shall continue to call things by their right names—i. e. a thief a *thief*, a robber a *robber*, a man stealer a *man stealer*!

We do not pretend, however, that we have always used the *best words*, and it is presumed our opponents will not pretend that they have been perfect in their choice of terms, and use of words. Of one thing, however, we are confident; and that is, the system of soul murder, called slavery, and which Mr. Wesley says is the "sum of all villanies," has never been abused by hard language, from the abolitionists. It is not in the power of language to represent it worse than it really is. "The devil," says Dr. Clarke, is the "great father of it,"—and I am sure he never begat a child more completely after his own likeness! But you have just called slavery, *soul murder*. Please turn to the 22d and 23d pages of this work, and see if *Southern testimony* does prove the truth of this assertion!

#### LOOK AT THIS MATTER.

Now is it not pretty business for Christians and clergymen to exhaust their be-

nevolence and spend their time in criticizing language, while they remain unmoved by the groaning of the prisoner, and the horrors of slavery; and while they are loading down abolitionists with the most severe and uncharitable epithets? While millions of degraded and defenceless Americans are piercing the heavens with their cries, and while our highest church officers are talking about the "rightful authority," and the "golden rule," (but I forbear,) shall I stop to prune my language, and soften my expressions? I can most solemnly and sincerely say, "*God forbid!*" Without attempting to make it appear that I have always used the *best words*, I wish it may be distinctly understood, that I purposely avoid soft words when I speak of slavery;—I do not wish to use milder language in speaking of that shocking abomination, than I would in speaking of theft and highway robbery—and if our friends will only keep up the distinction made by the General Conference, between the *sin* and the *sinner*, what I say of the former need not be construed to the disparagement of the latter. *I however make no such distinction!*

If my brethren choose to apply to *man stealing* milder terms than they do to *horse stealing*, I shall not object; but I cannot be bound by such rules and regulations. The truth may be spoken in *love*, even when it is spoken with *plainness* and *severity*; otherwise Christ and the apostles, Luther, Wesley, Clarke, Edwards, the Kentucky Synod, &c. &c. did not speak it in love. And otherwise our opponents, admitting that they speak the *truth* (!) do not speak it in love; for they will not deny, that they are *plain, pointed* and *severe*, when speaking of *us* and *our cause*. Look at our *provocations*—at the *slanders* which have been heaped upon us—the *lawless violence* which has been raised against us—the shocking abominations of slavery which have been portrayed before our eyes—the apologies and Scripture arguments of our do-nothing opponents;—I say look at those things, and judge whether our opponents would have done better in our circumstances. If they think they can, let them try it. But have they done better in their own circumstances? Have they set us an example in relation

to language that they would be willing to have imitated? Would they be willing we should speak of them as they have spoken of us? I will add no more in relation to this silly cavil about hard language.

#### SIN OF SLAVERY.

"But you hold that slavery is a sin under all circumstances." To be sure we do; for we think the sin consists in the *thing-itself*, and not in the circumstances. Slavery, in its *mildest form*, IS A VIOLATION OF THE RIGHTS OF MAN, AND OF THE PREROGATIVES OF JEHOVAH, and of course is nothing better than theft and robbery.

"But the slave is *willing* to be a slave." And so some are willing to be murdered; but does that make it right to murder them?

"But he is treated well." So are horses. "He is well fed." So are cattle. "But he is held for his good." So a person may be murdered for his good; but is it right to murder, in any case? "The laws forbid emancipation." Suppose they were to forbid praying? "But the slave will go into worse hands." *You don't know that.* No slave holder will pretend that he is the kindest man in all the country. But suppose he does go into worse hands; it is to the *general good* that we are to look, and not to particular cases. Let all the good slave holders come out and emancipate their slaves, and it would have a tendency to change public sentiment and the laws; but as long as good men sanction slavery by their example, the laws will never be likely to be made better.

Though slavery is a sin under all circumstances, it is not pretended that all slave holders are equally guilty. Idolatry is a sin under all circumstances, although sin may not be imputed where there is no light or law. But the *thing-itself*, God hates; it is opposed to the eternal rule of right, always and every where. Intemperance was as bad in *itself*, fifteen years ago, as now; but in many instances sin was not imputed then, where it would be now—"The time of this ignorance God winked at," &c. Circumstances cannot alter the *sin of slavery*, though they may affect the personal guilt of the slave holder.

We may do many things every day which are wrong in themselves, and wrong under all circumstances—but not having a clear perception of the moral turpitude of these acts, they may, perhaps, be pardoned.

But the time is near, if indeed it has not already come, when every slave holder in the land will be deeply guilty before God! I judge them not. What may seem impossible with men, may be possible with God.

It would be a heinous sin for me to hold a slave—and the thing in itself is just as bad in the hands of another man as it would be in mine. His guilt may not be the same, unless his light be equal.

#### PRESIDENT FISK'S ADDRESS.

I feel it my duty to take some notice of brother Fisk's Address to the Eastern and Northern Conferences; and will take the liberty, in this instance, also, to address my remarks *directly to him*.

*Dear Brother*—The numbers of the Christian Advocate and Journal containing your Address, are before me. I have, however, only room for a few general remarks.

And as two able brethren are now reviewing the same document through other mediums, I shall say less than I at first intended.

Having perhaps found yourself unable to answer our arguments, you now attempt to make it appear, that our measures are schismatical. You carry the idea, that a division of the church *under any circumstances*, would be, of all things, the most dreadful! This sentiment you undoubtedly suppose you can make many abolitionists believe. Your next step appears to be, to induce the more timid abolitionists to believe, that *such will be the inevitable consequences of abolitionism*—and thus you expect to *frighten* many (probably you think the greater portion) from our ranks; and then the rest may be given up as reprobates. But the result of this effort, remains to be seen.

You say, 'you love the church as the apple of your eye'—and not the less, I presume, because you have opposed so warmly and *pointedly* the manufactur-

ing, selling and drinking, what Robert Hall calls "liquid fire, and distilled damnation"—evils which have existed to an alarming extent, and do still exist in some measure in the Methodist Episcopal Church. You well know, that there was ten years ago, a warm opposition to your course on the temperance question, *in the M. E. Church*. No farther off than across the river, from where you reside, Methodist brethren have said, "we would be glad to hear Br. Fisk *preach the Gospel*, but we do not wish to hear him *preach temperance!*" I "testify that I have seen." And have not communications from you and Rev. T. Merritt on the temperance question, been refused a place in the Christian Advocate and Journal, in former years? If I recollect right, I have received such facts from your own mouth. If you have forgotten this matter, the Rev. N. Bangs can probably refresh your memory. One Methodist preacher published a pamphlet against you, and was doubtless as sincere as you are now in opposing abolitionism.

Now suppose you had been told, if you drive on with these ultra temperance measures at this rate, you will divide the Church; would you not have replied, "rather than have a *rum-making, rum-selling and rum-drinking* church, let it be divided? Would it not be better that the church should be rent than that (*intemperance*) should be continued?" Do you not know that you was once as warmly opposed on the temperance question as some of us are now on the abolition question? Do you not know that even doctors of divinity in the M. E. Church once opposed you? They were, perhaps, then, as honest in their belief, that you had left the gospel to preach politics, and that you was contributing your influence to "unite church and state" by giving Presbyterianism a national ascendancy, as you are now in opposing abolitionism by "Counter Appeals," "Letters," "Addresses," &c. You can suffer thousands of Methodist ministers and members to pursue a course which places them, according to Mr Wesley, "exactly on a level with men stealers," and remain silent! You can see a Methodist minister openly propose a division of the M. E. Church, unless a "*slave-*

holder" (exactly on a level with a man-stealer) can be made a *bishop*, and remain *dumb*; while you are out upon your brethren, who, according to your own showing, are the only "class of men who profess to be devoting themselves to this work," emancipation! You do not appear to have any fears that *slavery* or anti-abolition will divide the M. E. Church. No; it is only an opposition to sin that you fear. Is the M. E. Church such a "mother of harlots," that to oppose theft, robbery and adultery, will endanger her peace and safety? I am unwilling to believe this. What have we ever done more than to carry out the principles of Wesley and Wesleyan Methodism? Wherein are our principles or practices unchristian? And how is that which is *not unchristian* to divide a *Christian church*? You say you cannot "sit still and be silent" in view of abolitionism; but there are no horrors in *SLAVERY* that can disturb your quiet! What benevolence! what sympathy for suffering and bleeding humanity! You could, indeed, say, when in England, that "*slavery is evil—only evil—and that continually*"—but we hear nothing of this from you since you returned, nor did we hear any thing of it before you went.

You would do well, my dear brother, to bear in mind one fact; it is this: "The wisdom that is from above is *FIRST pure, THEN peaceable*." But anti-abolitionism reverses the sentiment, of this text, (I would to God that this were a solitary instance of the kind,) and puts *peace* before *purity*. Such is the tenor of your reasoning upon this subject. The Church must not be disturbed—that which has a tendency to disturb or "dismember the church" must be wrong. No exceptions are made—no intimations are given that the *church may be wrong*. How much this looks like taking the ground that the church is *infallible*—and that whoever opposes any thing that the church tolerates, is a *heretic*. What higher claims were ever set up by the Scribes and Pharisees of old, or by the papists and Episcopalians in the time of Luther and Wesley? It is a fearful state of things when the church will not bear to be reprov'd for her sins—and when her highest officers will oppose more heartily her reprovers,

than her errors. Popery has cried "schism" and "dismemberment" louder than brother Fisk can; but do these cries of heresy, prove that the sins of the church ought not to be reprov'd? whose fault was it that the reformation divided the Roman church? Whose fault was it that Methodism divided the Protestant Episcopal church? And whose fault will it be, if opposition to *theft* and *robbery* divide the Methodist E. Church?

*No abolitionist wishes the Methodist E. Church divided*—and if it is not held together by slavery, there is no danger that abolitionism will divide it—and if it is held together by the wages of unrighteousness, no matter how soon it is divided—*the sooner the better*. One thing is certain; it is always *right* and always *safe* to oppose all sin—and no plant that my Father hath planted will be rooted up by such a course.

But you quote scripture to show, that those who disturb the church, are great sinners. And how do you quote it? Why about as correctly as a certain character quoted it to Christ.

The following is the passage, as quoted by yourself: "Mark *those that cause divisions among us—and avoid them*." This you marked, as a quotation from the Bible. But not only are the most important parts of the text omitted, but the words which I have *italicised* are not in it! These words are, "home-made" Scripture; or perhaps I might say *anti-abolition* Scripture; or if you please *anti-schism* Scripture. The abolitionists have no occasion to garble the word of God in this manner, *to make out a case*! The following is the whole verse: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, *contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned*; and avoid them." Compare this with brother Fisk's quotation, and then judge how well the Bible, *as it is*, serves his cause. It was only those who "caused divisions and offences *contrary to the doctrine which they had learned*," that were to be "avoided." Christ himself, came, as he tells us, to divide families; i. e. to preach doctrines which would be received by some, and opposed by others; and thus divisions would be the result. Now the question is, is abolition-

ism "contrary to the doctrines which we have learned? If so, let it be shown. That abolitionism is contrary to the doctrines of the "Counter Appeal," is admitted; but that it is contrary to the Bible, is denied; and the proof is challenged. But it would seem we are to be tried by a new standard. The question is not now, what is right and according to the scriptures—but what will the church bear? What will cause divisions "*among us?*" Brother Fisk will not pretend that Christ and the apostles did wrong in disturbing the Jewish church, nor that Martin Luther did wrong in disturbing the Romish church, which was undoubtedly once as pure as the Methodist church ever was—nor yet that John Wesley did wrong in disturbing the Church of England; but he seems to take it for granted, that the M. E. Church is so infallible that she must not be agitated, though she makes merchandize of the souls and bodies of men! What did the Roman Catholic Church ever do *worse than this?*

What is it that "causes *divisions and offences* contrary" to the Bible? **SLAVERY!** It divides families—separates husbands and wives—parents and children—annuls the marriage relation—withholds from hundreds of thousands in our country all the means of knowledge and grace! It has awfully corrupted the M. E. Church; but brother Fisk can find no time to oppose this *soul murder!* He represents those who are lifting up their voice like a trumpet against these abominations, as "schismatics" who are to be "avoided." It is slavery that causes "offences," and violates every precept of the decalogue. But the new doctrine is, it must not be opposed, if such opposition would endanger the peace of the church!

Has Br. Fisk ever reflected that anti-abolitionists *may* cause a division in the church? Does he not know, that his course and that of others who think and act with him, is *drawing the lines of "party?"* Does he not know, that such opposition is consolidating and uniting the abolitionists all over the land? May not the mangled Scripture which he has applied to us, be after all, with more propriety applied to him and his "party?"

I repeat, that no abolitionist wishes

the division of the Church—abolitionists love the Church, perhaps, as well as their opponents; but they will not sacrifice "*purity*" to "*peace*;" nor consent to a compromise of truth with error. Suppose an opposition to the "most complicated villany," should prove the occasion of a division of the M. E. Church! Would the world be likely to come to an end any sooner on that account? Is it *certain*, that in such an event, a stop would be put to *all revivals?* Does Br. Fisk *know*, that if the M. E. Church were divided into two or more parts, as much good would not be done as is done now? How can he *know this?* Will not a faithful opposition to all sin be likely to be overruled for the glory of God and the good of souls? We are willing to risk it.

It may be said that the M. E. Church has prospered as she is. True; but does this prove that *slavery* has been the *cause* of her prosperity? or that an opposition to slavery will destroy it?—Does it prove that she would not prosper more abundantly if she were free from slavery? Or does it prove that fewer souls would be converted if she existed in two or more bodies? Is a division of the church the *worst thing* that could take place under the sun?—Would it be worse than *slave holding*, which is, according to Mr. Wesley, "*man stealing?*" I trust the abolitionists will not be driven, by your *scarecrow* of a division of the church, to abandon their principles.

It is said that the church is built upon a rock, and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." If, therefore, abolitionism is from *above*, it will not harm the church, of course; and if it is from beneath, the church is *safe*; for the gates of hell are not to prevail against it! And if there is any church not built upon the *rock*, no matter how soon it is divided.

The abolitionists, I am confident, will NEVER LEAVE THE CHURCH, if they can have any rights *in it*—and if slave holders and anti-abolitionists can gain any thing by dividing the church, they may, for aught I know, divide it. Indeed, some, to *sustain slavery*, have already thrown out such a hint. But no fear of such a result will deter us from taking *Wesleyan ground* on the subject

of slavery. Let this be well understood, and let our opponents govern themselves accordingly. The abolitionists will never leave the church, unless they are driven out by the *spirit of slavery*.

In the following sentences, we have a curious specimen of anti-abolition logic:

"Many seem to suppose that *abolitionism* means the *abolishment of slavery*, and hence they represent all those who oppose *abolitionism*, as opposed to the abolishment of slavery. Now this would be a necessary consequence only, in case that abolitionism and the emancipation of the slaves were identical. But they are not identical—they are two distinct things; as may be seen by this obvious consideration: *abolitionism exists*—has a *present being*—but the slaves are not emancipated. *Abolitionism* exists, therefore, without emancipation—and must of course be *another thing*, unless it should be claimed that the *same thing* may be and may not be, at the *same time*."

Is this the way you reason, my dear brother? Is this the way you teach your pupils to reason? I must say, that I am more surprised at these expressions, than at any thing which has ever fallen from your pen! I will apply your rule to a few things. "Many seem to suppose that Christianity means the" conversion of the world, "and hence they represent those who oppose" Christianity, "as opposed to the" conversion of the world. "But they are not identical—they are two distinct things"—Christianity *exists*—has a *present being*—but the "world is not converted. "A man, therefore, may oppose" Christianity "as it exists among us, not only without a *design* to support" *infidelity*, "but without supporting it *in fact*." You can easily apply your reasoning to colonization, education, temperance, &c., and if you do not become sick of such logic, I misjudge your character. How hard a man of your talents must be pressed for arguments, when he will resort to such a method of reasoning! And how suspicious that cause appears, that either requires or admits of such a defence! And yet, you pretend to believe that all will admit this view of the subject "to be a *fair one*!" If there is no "human device," no "adroit and sophistical ambiguity" *here*, I know not where to look for such things.

You speak of the "sublime and holy enterprises" of "the church" in con-

trast with "modern abolitionism."—Wonder if slavery is one of those "enterprises"—if not, *what is it?*

You say, you hold the abolitionists "responsible, both as a PARTY and as INDIVIDUALS, for the general character of their measures, for their official doings, for the doings of their accredited agents, and for the general course of their accredited papers." I suppose you will be willing to be tried by the same rule. I will then hold you responsible for the "official doings" of Colonization Societies, "for the doings of their accredited agents, and for the general course of their accredited periodicals." I also hold you responsible for the "official doings" of anti-abolitionists—their "accredited agents and papers." So on your principle, you must swallow the the New York Conference *gag law*—the Baltimore Conference *slave trade regulation*—the Georgia Conference resolution, that "*slavery is not a moral evil*," endorsed by the South Carolina Conference—the doings of the General Conference; and last, though not least, slavery enjoined under certain circumstances by the "Golden Rule!"

You will not, of course, refuse to be held responsible for those official "doings and sayings" of Colonization Societies, agents, and periodicals, which I have noticed in my review of your 4th of July address! And when you shall feel yourself able to take *additional responsibilities*, from the *same sources*, and of a *similar kind*, the colonization reports, and a complete set of the *African Repository*, now in my possession, will furnish you with an abundant supply.

You say,

"The age of wonders is not passed. Former ages may have had their physical wonders—their supernatural wonders, their wondrous heroes and sages. But it was reserved for the present age to astonish the world by its *logical wonders*!"

I will only add a few more specimens of your "logical wonders"—for in truth I cannot perceive more than two or three *distinct ideas* in your five long articles,—perhaps I might say *one*, viz., "abolitionism is schism!"

"Suppose then, Mr. Scott's plan succeeds, and that which he and other leading abolitionists aim at, is accomplished. Does not every

one see that this would be schism? It would be an exclusion from the functions and privileges of the Church, on the principles which the Church itself, in its highest judicatory, has decided shall not be ground for such exclusion. [Where has Mr. Scott ever proposed the exclusion of members?] A part assume the right, extra-judicially, to make new terms of communion! a minority decide, on principle, and by practice, that those whom the church recognizes as her official and private members, are not worthy of Christian confidence and Christian ordinances! Is not this of itself schism? Is not this very act an assumption on the part of the minority, of the right to make their own terms of communion, independent of the body?"

"As administrators of Discipline, they must drive the members of their own Church from the Lord's table, and that too contrary to the judgment and laws of the Church. It is acting, not only without law, but against law—on their own private judgment; depriving men of their constitutional rights, for which they profess to be such great sticklers; assuming an irresponsible power, and thus, as far as their authority and influence go, assuming, in principle, the very quintessence of tyranny—for what is it to play the tyrant, but to deprive men of their legal rights, on the ground of one's own private judgment and will? He who avows this sentiment is a disorganizer in theory; the man who practises upon it, is a disorganizer in practice, as well as an oppressor and violator of constitutional rights; and he who gives himself up to disseminate these sentiments, and urge others of the community of which he is a member to adopt them, is an open schismatic, and is inveighing against our doctrine and discipline.

"In other words, the very change for which our brethren contend, brought about by the means which they have adopted and are pursuing, would be subversive of our ecclesiastical constitution. FOR LET IT BE REMEMBERED, THEY PROPOSE ALTERING THE TERMS OF COMMUNION; or in other words, propose changing the moral discipline of the Church; and they are seeking this change by popular excitement and agitation."

Where and when have we ever "proposed altering the terms of communion?" Does not Br. Fisk know we have never done this? Suppose you should express a doubt whether those who make an habitual use of ardent spirits should be admitted to our pulpits and our communion tables—would that be proposing new terms of communion? And have we ever done more than this? Is there no difference between a proposition to make alterations, and the expression of a sentiment in relation to what would be right? Here we are abused and misrepresented.

That your object in your address is to divide our ranks—by alarming the more timid—and so get a majority against us

in all the conferences, and then administer to us *strict anti-abolition justice*, is evident from the following expressions among many others that might be gathered from your articles. The two following sentences are from a single article.

"What say you, brethren, you that love the order of the Church better than abolitionism—for with others I have no hope—is it not time to pause?"

"Again we say then, to all our candid brethren, who love the Church better than they love abolitionism, that if present measures are persisted in by abolitionists, there must be a division of the Church."

Who will divide it? Abolitionists have no intention of dividing it. And will our opponents divide the Church, because we oppose slavery? Br. Fisk, for aught I know, may be in possession of such a fact. But we shall not cease our opposition to slavery, for fear our opponents will divide the Church!

Speaking of Br. Storrs and myself, you say:

"These agents go from conference to conference, at their annual sessions, with the evident design to stir up an opposition to the presiding bishop, and to urge these conferences into their measures; this is intolerable. See their letters from these conferences, detailing their plans and operations. Who can read them without the most mortifying and painful sensations? Who are these men that are *dogging the bishops* from conference to conference? They are men who have been brought up upon the knees of these venerable fathers."

"Dogging the bishops!" Pretty expression! How mild! How gentlemanly! "*Dogging*!!" Have we taken any dogs with us? If not, I suppose we are the "*dogs*!" Thus Br. Fisk designates his brethren!!!

Br. Storrs and myself attended three or four conferences last season, not for the purpose of "*dogging the bishops*," or even of opposing them; but for the purpose of conferring with our brethren in the ministry, upon the great sin of slavery, which exists to an alarming extent in the M. E. Church! And have we not a right to do this? As good a right as other brethren have to visit conferences, to confer with them upon temperance, peace, colonization, or education! May not brethren who have spent much of their time for years in investigating a subject, have some light upon it, that others, who have devoted

little or no attention to it, may not be in possession of? Is not this true of Br. Fisk on the subject of *temperance*? Suppose he were to visit some of the conferences, stir them up on temperance (and some of them need agitation on that subject)—would it be proper for me to accuse him of “foreign interference” and “dogging the bishops?”

Or if he were to visit the conferences to enlighten them on the sublime subject of colonization, would it be proper to taunt him as above?

Would *any* colonization agent (not to say one of our brethren in the ministry) who should visit the New England Conference, be treated as you have treated Brother Storrs and myself?

We only wish our brethren to *inform themselves*;—and is it a *crime* to bring this subject before them?

I have been urgently requested to attend several of the Western conferences (all indeed except one), that I have not yet been able to visit, and *by members of those conferences*!—and must I be accused of dogging the bishops, because I go where I am *invited*, and conduct *peaceably*?

We lectured more at the Genesee Conference than any other. I gave six public lectures, and Br. Storrs two. An anti-slavery society of about one hundred members was formed among the preachers. At a full meeting of the society, the following resolution was passed, nearly unanimously.

“On motion of W. Hoag, Resolved, that our Rev. and beloved brethren O. Scott and G. Storrs are entitled to our sincere and hearty thanks for their very able and interesting lectures on the subject of slavery and abolitionism, delivered in this place, and that our best wishes and prayers shall accompany them in their labors and efforts in behalf of the oppressed and down-trodden slave.”

This resolution would have passed by a handsome majority, in open conference, had no more voted for it than voted in the society. The society comprised about three quarters of the conference, I believe; and it was only a *few*, who came into the society to defeat its operations, that voted against the resolution. So much for our intrusions and “dogging the bishops!” But the subject is too disgusting to pursue further.

#### DIVISION OF THE CHURCH.

That there is a *deep-laid plan* at headquarters, to crush the abolitionists, there is too much reason to believe.

It is undoubtedly the design, by the cry of “schism,” to frighten a large portion of the abolitionists to abandon their principles, and then, *by grinding oppression*, to drive the others out of the Church! Hints, to the effect that we ought to leave Church, have already been thrown out from high places, and circulated through the country! The severity with which we are handled in our official paper, while no equal opportunity is given us to reply to the multiplied slanders and personal abuse which our opponents are constantly heaping upon us, speaks a language not to be misunderstood, respecting their *designs* and *determinations* in relation to ourselves!

Articles like that signed “Honestus,” for which, the editor of *Zion’s Herald* says, the Alton mob would give the writer three cheers, may be admitted into the Advocate, while replies to that miserable anti-republican flummery are rejected. One brother may be charged by another, some dozen times, more or less, with falsehood, as I have been by Rev. N. Bangs in the 594th and 595th numbers of the Advocate, and no explanation or reply can be admitted! Another brother may represent some two thousand Methodist preachers, travelling and local, and tens of thousands of Church members, as “schismatics,” while communications in reply, from such brethren as Rev. Jotham Horton of the East, and Rev. Luther Lee of the West, are *peremptorily rejected*!

I have been told, that one of the reasons assigned, *in writing*, for rejecting the reply of the former, was, that if it were admitted, it would place President Fisk *in the light of Luther’s opponents*! In what light, I would ask, do his own communications place him?

Moral and Christian character may be *murdered* by writers in the Advocate,—motives may be called in question, and the sentiments and objects of thousands and tens of thousands may be misrepresented—and that, too, without allowing us the privileges granted to the *worst of criminals*, viz. a hearing! These are the *men*, and these the *measures*, which pro-



fess to be trying to prevent a division of the Church! Fine method this, to heal dissensions and prevent divisions. Our brethren cannot be so blind as not to see that the course they are pursuing is directly calculated to divide the Church. Was the treatment which we are now receiving, and have been receiving for months and years from the Advocate, for injustice and cruelty ever paralleled among those who bear the the Christian name? We ask not mercy; give us but the justice of *heathenism*, and we will be satisfied.

Can there be any doubt that there is a *train now laid* to bring abolitionism in the M. E. Church, to a speedy crisis, by a mighty attempt to rescue the more timid and fearful among the abolitionists, and give up the rest? But I apprehend our opponents have mistaken the character of abolitionists, if they suppose they can either flatter or drive them to abandon their principles. *We shall be in no hurry to "take ourselves out of the Church."* We have as good a right in it as our opposers have; and we have as much right to *oppose* slavery, as they have to *apologize* for it and support it by *Bible arguments* and the *Golden Rule*. *They will not get rid of us quite so easy.* It will take a good many *hints* to drive us from our own ground. And it will take more logic and rhetoric than can be mustered from the Wesleyan University, including the Book Room, with the addition of our Missionary Secretary, to drive *Methodist abolitionists* from the TRUE WESLEYAN ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD!

Brethren! we have *no rights* in our official paper. We are treated by that organ as *outlaws*! Let us then rally to the support of the *Watchman, Herald*, and the *Maine Wesleyan Journal*.

Let us pray for our opponents—pray that they may have a disposition to treat us as *carefully* and *tenderly* as they do *SLAVERY*. That is all we ask, and more than we now expect. Let us maintain our steadfastness, love our enemies, plead the cause of the oppressed, trust in God—and all shall be well.

I find the foregoing views fully corroborated by Rev. L. R. SUNDERLAND, in the *Watchman* of the 24th of March, which has just come to hand, and which

balance of this article. Br. Sunderland is in the midst of our opponents, and knows their movements. The following remarks from his pen are worthy of a more permanent place than a newspaper article.

"Let us now inquire, what the abolitionists in the M. E. Church have done, to expose them to the charge of schism, which President Fisk and a few others have so openly and solemnly preferred against them. Have they ever refused to *fellowship* their anti-abolition brethren? Have they ever refused to admit an anti-abolitionist into the Church on account of his anti-abolitionism? Have they ever refused to invite a brother to preach on the account of his opposition to abolition? Have they ever refused to extend to their anti-abolition brethren, the usual courtesies common among Christians of the same faith? Have they ever excluded their anti-abolition brethren from their pulpits? Have they ever passed resolutions requiring pledges of them, not to lecture against abolition? Have they ever passed extra-judicial censures upon them, in relation to matters purely cognizable by the Discipline of the Church? Have they ever attempted to monopolize one of the official organs of the Church, through which to oppose anti-abolitionism? Has any abolitionist, having charge of a circuit, ever OFFICIALLY ADVISED a preacher under him not to invite an anti-abolitionist to preach or pray in any of the churches on the circuit? And when any such preacher did invite an anti-abolitionist to preach or pray, was any abolitionist ever known to censure him for it?

"None of these things have we done. But every one of them, and more, have been done by anti-abolitionists. And yet, they are the men to charge us with the *schism*!!

"Let us particularize.

#### NEW TEST FOR MEMBERSHIP.

"We know a brother, who was refused admission into full membership in the M. E. Church, and for which no reason could be assigned, except his having circulated Wesley's *Thoughts on Slavery*.

"Pres. Fisk, referring to the abolitionists in the M. E. Church, and speaking of the *act* of the last General Assembly, by which that body cut off a number of its lower judicatories, who were supposed to be guilty of some errors, and after stating that the General Assembly answers in authority to our General Conference, adds:—'*I do not say this could not be done with us.*'

"It is true, he thinks such a process a hazardous experiment, involving ruinous effects, and of uncertain issue. But, 'he does not say it could not be done with us.' Nor can any one doubt, who has read what has recently appeared in the *Christian Advocate* and *Journal* upon this subject, but that the opinion so cautiously hinted at by President Fisk, is gaining ground among the more prominent anti-abolitionists; the plain English of which is, that the abolitionists may be cut off from the Church, *en masse*, and abolition made a disqualification for life in the M. E. Church. Indeed

if the inquisitorial process is carried out, which has been begun in the New York Conference, on this subject, it may not be long before there will be more than 'one condition required of all who desire admission into the M. E. Church,' and our ministers and members, instead of being required to renounce slavery, will be required to renounce abolitionism, or be expelled the Church.

#### PROSCRIPTION.

"The new rule in our Discipline for the trial of superannuated preachers, out of the bounds of the Conference to which they belong, was talked of in this city, before the session of the General Conference by which it was passed, and with particular reference to the bearing it might have upon the editor of Zion's Watchman. Nay, more, we can prove, that one of the delegates from the New York Conference, immediately after the adoption of that rule by the General Conference, was heard to say, 'Now, we've got a *trap* for La Roy Sunderland.'

"A noted anti-abolitionist has made not less than two successive, but ineffectual attempts to procure from another Conference a vote of censure or excommunication, against an abolitionist, founded on statements made in connection with this controversy; and were the particulars of those cases to be laid before the public, we believe the charges which were preferred, and the means used to sustain them, would be set down by every candid mind, as forming a series of combined unmixt persecution, alike unparalleled for its severity and injustice, at least, in the annals of the Methodist E. Church.

"The abolitionists, as a class, have, from the beginning, been most egregiously misrepresented and injured, through the columns of a paper, which is the common property of us all, and during the whole of this time, they have been denied an equal privilege of defending themselves through the same medium.

"In some places abolitionists are not invited, nor permitted to take a part in prayer and social religious meetings, purely on account of their being abolitionists. They are indirectly blamed for attending meetings, and censured if they stay away.

"Anti-abolition ministers refuse to ask abolitionists to preach in their pulpits, or to speak or pray in a prayer meeting. Nay, they have used their influence and official authority to prevent the ministers who are under them from inviting abolitionists to pray or preach in their pulpits, and they have *censured* them for doing so. A board of trustees have passed a resolution requesting the preacher in charge not to invite any known abolitionist to preach in any of the churches on the circuit; and when an abolitionist has been invited to preach in one of those churches, extraordinary measures have been used to prevent it. And when, more than two years since, an abolitionist preached in a certain Methodist church, a famous anti-abolitionist, a man, too, who was once expelled from the M. E. Church for —, was heard to say, immediately after the sermon, 'that fellow shall never preach here again,' or words to this effect.

"On some circuits there is an understanding between a few anti-abolitionists and the ministers, that no abolitionist shall be invited to

preach in any of the churches; and accordingly, abolition brethren, when present at meetings held by those preachers, are never invited either to speak or pray. They are openly and publicly slighted in the face of noonday, and all this because they are abolitionists. How far such *proscription* is chargeable upon anti-abolitionists, as a class, we do not pretend to say, but that the above facts are true, to some extent, we do know, and can prove, by giving names, places, and dates, if necessary, and much more than we have named or referred to under this head.

"Here, then, is *SCHISM—real, practical SCHISM!* A kind of schism, too, which is known and approved by those who have had so much to say lately in the Christian Advocate and Journal for the purpose of fixing the 'crime of schism' upon the abolitionists.

"We have no doubt but that the appointments of preachers have been fixed and changed merely on account of their being abolitionists. Nor have we any doubt but measures are desired if not contemplated, by which the abolitionists in our Church may be crushed at a blow, whatever may be the consequences to the Church, or to the world.

#### EXTRA-JUDICIAL CENSURES.

"How often have we been accused of extra-judicial measures against two of our bishops? Why, it has often been asked, 'Why don't you prefer charges against them, and have them tried according to Discipline?' And those ask these questions who themselves know, that we have never thought our bishops guilty of any crime; and they further know, that, for the acts of their administration of which complaint has been made, there is no rule in our Discipline under which they could now be tried, were we disposed to bring them to trial.

"But look at the charges of our opponents. One reports us through the columns of our official paper, as having inveighed against our Discipline, a crime for which one is liable to be expelled from the Church. Another reports us as having commenced a revolution to divide the Church. Another, that we are opposed to the regular authorities of the Church, as having formally and publicly renounced Methodism. Another publicly charges some of us, with having left the regular work, and boldly takes it upon himself to pronounce, virtually, a sentence of excommunication upon a brother, without a regular charge, trial, judge or jury. Nay, he declares, that "those who permit Mr. Scott to preach, to administer baptism or the Lord's Supper, or to perform the marriage ceremony, are violators of the rules of their Church, and are held accountable to their Annual Conferences for their misperpetrations!"

"Was the like ever heard of! An able, pious, and popular minister in the M. E. Church, without a disciplinary charge against his moral, Christian or ministerial character, without a trial before a committee, or the Conference of which he has been for some fifteen or twenty years an acceptable and useful member, is proclaimed by one of his peers in another Conference, through our official paper, as an ecclesiastical outlaw—"NOT ALLOWED TO EXERCISE his peculiar functions, nor even to preach among us!" And this is the Metho-

been made to groan lately, and column after column filled, in the paper which is the common property of us all, to give publicity to these EXTRA JUDICIAL SENTENCES OF CON-  
**DEMNATION!**

#### REFUSAL OF CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.

"Now, we ask, what Christian fellowship have some of our anti-abolition brethren for us, while they refuse us the courtesies common to Christians, and especially those common to Methodists and Methodist ministers. They have refused us the privilege of preaching the Gospel in their pulpits. Were we to become SLAVE HOLDERS, probably the pulpits of the M. E. Churches in this city, would be opened to us, without any difficulty, as the following facts will show.

"The Rev. George Storrs, a local elder in good and regular standing in the M. E. Church, happening to be in this city on the 11th of March, 1838, was invited by one of our ministers on the west circuit, to preach for him on the afternoon of that day in the Duane street church. Without any special efforts to circulate intelligence of the expectation that Br. Storrs would preach that afternoon, a much larger congregation than usual was in attendance there at the hour of meeting. Without attempting to detail all the circumstances attending the extraordinary measures taken by the Rev. C. W. C., Rev. J. F. N., and others, to PREVENT Br. Storrs from preaching, it may be sufficient to say, they were successful, and he was PREVENTED from preaching that afternoon, and had to content himself with a seat in the altar, while hundreds went away from the church, not only disappointed, but deeply grieved by what had taken place.

"But the principal incident remains to be told: Before that congregation was dismissed, they were informed that brother Smith, from the South, would preach in John Street, that evening. That brother Smith is a local minister in our Church and a SLAVE HOLDER. Facts by scores could be narrated, to show that most of our brethren, who are 'as much opposed to slavery as any body,' are, nevertheless, more opposed to abolition than they are to the 'great evil of slavery.' Indeed, what can be more evident? Slave holders come and go among us without rebuke. They are invited and received to our pulpits (of this we do not now complain) while abolitionists, who are in good and regular standing in the Church, are, by anti-abolitionists, refused the privilege of participating in the exercises even of a prayer meeting. Nay, they have refused us the privilege of assisting in the devotions of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. They have refused us the privilege of participating with them in the devotions peculiar to funeral occasions. They have PROHIBITED our own brethren from inviting us to pray, publicly, in the house of God, and censured them for not complying with such a prohibition. They have refused us the hand in exchanging the common civilities of the brotherhood, and even to speak to us when we have addressed them, merely, as we believe, because we were abolitionists. And when speaking of us in their public communications, instead of the common forms of address, which have obtained among us from the

beginning of Methodism, it is 'Mr. A.' 'Mr. B.' 'that writer,' 'that fellow,' &c. &c.

"Hence we say, from the above, and other similar facts, which might be named, it is as plain as day light, that a disposition prevails among our opponents to crush us. Their motto seems to be, 'Death to abolition!' 'No fellowship for abolitionists!'

"But when, let us ask, when were any of our opponents ever treated by abolitionists in this way? When the Rev. S. Olin attended the session of the New England Conference, in 1836, SLAVE HOLDER as he was, he was invited to preach, and the Conference requested a copy of his sermon for publication. And when the Rev. N. Bangs, one of the most inveterate and determined opposers which abolition ever had, attended the two last sessions of the same Conference, though many believed his principal object in being there, was to prefer charges against one of its members, was he treated as he and his anti-abolition brethren have treated us for two years past? No. The abolitionists, as deeply as they believe their opponents have misrepresented and injured them, have never withheld Christian fellowship from them on this account.

"Now, we ask, is there no 'schism,' no 'alienation of affection,' in this treatment which we are constantly receiving at the hand of our brethren? Is this treatment brotherly? Is it Christian-like? Is it Methodistical? Is it the better way to heal a division, when one is once begun? Or are such measures calculated to prevent 'schism in the body?'

"Members and Ministers of the Methodist E. Church? will you, can you, approve of such measures as these? What, let us ask, what have your brethren done, who are called abolitionists, to deserve such treatment as this? Is there any Discipline for this proscription? Any thing peculiar in Methodism for this withholding of fellowship from brethren who oppose slavery?

"Is it a relic of Wesleyanism to spurn abolitionists and fellowship SLAVERY? And while we conscientiously cling to the Discipline and the church of which we are members, and extend the arms of our affection to those who attempt to crush us, are we to be denounced and posted in our official journals as schismatics? Is there no law, no justice for us in the church, which is the 'Mother of us all? Is it nothing to you that some of the men who are thus proscribed were in the church before some of their persecutors were born? Is it nothing for our opposers to consider, that God is now most wonderfully pouring out his Holy Spirit upon those Conferences where abolition abounds, and where abolition measures have been the most rife for two or three years past? Is it nothing, that among the abolitionists there are many members and ministers who are among the oldest and most useful in the Methodist E. Church? And is it nothing that such as these should be MISREPRESENTED, SLIGHTED, and PROSCRIBED? Where, O where is the spirit of Christianity? Where is the genius of Methodism? Where that yearning of bowels, that forbearance, that courtesy and kindness, for which Methodist Ministers and members were once so well known! Alas! where!

## LYNN CONVENTION.

The following resolutions were adopted at the Methodist Anti-Slavery Convention, held at Lynn, Mass., Oct. 25th and 26th, 1837, I believe without one dissenting voice.

"That the object contemplated in the deliberations of this Convention, is stated in the call just now read, viz.: 'Not to engage in any innovations upon the institutions of our Church,' but to confer together upon the rights of annual conferences, and the duty of the Church of which we are members, in view of the great sin of American slavery.

"That those of our brethren who take the liberty to condemn either our principles or measures, while they refuse to inform themselves of either, do thereby manifest a lamentable deficiency in candor and liberality.

"That we entertain no unchristian feeling towards the ministers and members of the M. E. Church, who are slave holders, but we exercise toward them the same pity and spirit of prayer, which we wish others to manifest toward ourselves, whenever they consider us guilty of criminal offences.

"That those who manifest more opposition to the abolition principles and measures, than they do against the sin of slavery, cannot expect us to believe they are not deceived when they tell us, they are 'as much opposed to slavery as we are.'

"That as long as the Discipline of the M. E. Church forbids the 'intention' of enslaving men, women and children as a sin, and represents slavery as a 'great evil,' we shall have its authority for carrying forward the present anti-slavery enterprise.

"That the opinion expressed by the Baltimore Annual Conference, at its last session, which went to say, that there was no sin in the slave trade, except in its attendant circumstances, can never be reconciled with the rule of our Discipline upon this subject, nor with the views generally entertained of the slave trade by the ministers and members of our Church.

"That the anti-slavery cause, in which, as ministers and members of the M. E. Church, we are engaged, contravenes no principle, or usage, authorized in the Discipline of the church aforesaid, and that, therefore, those do us great injustice, who, instead of meeting us upon the question at issue, attempt to make it appear, that our anti-slavery measures conflict with the constituted authorities of the church to which we belong.

"That the fact disclosed in a sermon published recently, by request of the South Carolina Conference, viz., that the rule in our Discipline against buying and selling human beings, 'is PERFECTLY USELESS, in most places at the South,' should alarm the ministers and members of our entire church, and stimulate them to greater diligence in opposing the 'great evil' of slavery.

"That slavery is 'contrary to the laws of God, man and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion; and doing what we would not that

others should do unto us,' and when the General Conference of the M. E. Church as well as each of the annual conferences, bear this testimony against slavery as a sin, as our church did in 1780, we may then, and not till then, truly say, 'We are as much as ever opposed to the great evil of slavery.'

"That when it was a rule in our form of Discipline, as it was in 1784, that 'Those who bought or sold SLAVES, or gave them away, unless on purpose to free them, should be expelled immediately,' we believe the M. E. Church was more opposed to slavery than it has been since this rule was left out of the disciplinary regulations of our Church.

"That, to denounce the system of slavery as sinful, and at the same time, attempt to show, that holding servants in such a sense that the laws pronounce them slaves, forms no part of this system; or in other words, that the holding of slaves, by ministers and members of the M. E. Church, may be and is done in obedience to the Saviour's Golden Rule, involves an inconsistency, which can never be reconciled with the unperverted dictates of Scripture or reason.

"That if, as many would have us believe, circumstances do prevent sin from accompanying the act of slavcholding, in those who have the Bible for the rule of their conduct, then it must follow, that circumstances may also render every other act innocent, which human beings are capable of committing.

"That, attempting to justify slavery under 'certain circumstances,' only, is no more nor less, than all slaveholders themselves will do; for no tyrant ever attempted to justify slavery under all circumstances.

"That, allowing slavery to continue innocently, under certain circumstances, and of which the enslaver himself is to be the only judge, is allowing all which is essentially necessary for the perpetual dominion of the most cruel oppressor.

"That those persons who have taken upon them the vows of Christianity, in free New England, who go South and become the owners of slaves, are recreant to the interests of pure religion, traitors to the Church of which they are members, and deserving of the severest censure.

"That, as we have reason to believe, some purer spirits in the South cherish the holy principles of abolition, immediate and universal, we hail them as brethren in the work of emancipation, and bid them God speed in well doing.

"That 'we are more than ever convinced of the great evil' and exceeding sinfulness of holding slaves; and that, therefore, we pledge ourselves to God and one another, that we will, both by word and deed, show our opposition to it, and labor by all proper and Christian means, to enlighten the public mind with regard to this sin, and the shocking evil of its continuance in a country professing Christianity.

"That we approve of the Constitution, of the principles and measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and we ask for that benevolent institution, the prayers and co-operation of all Christian people who wish to aid in overthrowing the system of American slavery.

"That we repudiate the principles and measures of the American Colonization Society, as alike hostile to the best interests of the free

people of color in this land, and the emancipation of the enslaved.

"That the distinctions, usually made in the house of God, on the account of color, such as denying persons the privilege of choosing their seats, and withholding from them the holy sacrament, till the white members of the church are served, are practices utterly irreconcilable with the spirit and precepts of the Christian religion.

"That in the opinion of this Convention, the purity of the Methodist Episcopal Church is intimately connected with freedom of speech and of the press—and that there is no impropriety in a fair and full discussion of the administration of our Church officers, as these matters involve principles, which we all have a right to investigate.

"That annual conferences have a right to express an opinion on any moral question—a right of which neither the General Conference, nor any of its officers, can justly deprive them.

"That in all questions of order, there is, and ought to be, the right of appeal from the decisions of the chair, to the Conference.

"That we have the utmost confidence in the moral integrity of our bishops; and while we award to them purity of motive and goodness of intention, in all they have done, we cannot but regret, that they have felt it their duty to take a course, in some of the conferences, which we believe to be unauthorized by the Discipline of the Methodist E. Church, and which we consider dangerous as a PRECEDENT, and oppressive in its tendency.

"That it is the solemn and deliberate judgment of this Convention, that all ministers of the Gospel are bound to preach against the sin of slaveholding; and not to do so shows a want of information on the subject, which is inexcusable, or a spirit of expediency which does not comport with the character of one who is set to declare the whole counsel of God."

"That this Convention consider the course taken by the editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal, for three years past, in publishing articles against the abolition cause, while they have refused to publish any thing for this cause, as illiberal and unjust."

#### COMMUNICATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE LYNN CONVENTION.

*From Springfield, Mass.*

"To the Convention to be holden at Lynn, Mass. Oct. 25th, 1837.

"At a meeting of the members of the Anti-Slavery Society connected with the Wesley and Asbury stations of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Springfield, Mass. held at the Asbury Chapel, Oct. 20, 1837, the following resolutions were adopted.

"1st. That this meeting disapprove of Slavery; that we consider it a sin against God, even in its mildest forms, and that it ought to be immediately abolished.

"2d. That we cordially approve of the leading measures of Rev. T. Merritt, O. Scott, G. Storrs, and other members of the New England and New Hampshire conferences, in their movements against Slavery.

"3d. That in the opinion of this meeting, some of the bishops have transcended their

power, in some of our annual conferences, in refusing to put certain motions disapproving of Southern Slavery, while they have put motions disapproving and censuring the course of our abolition brethren.

"4th. That we disapprove of the course pursued by the presiding bishop, at our last annual conference in deciding that it was not in order, to refer the memorials of between 3 and 4000 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the bounds of the N. E. Conference, on slavery, to a committee to report thereon, and refused to appeal from that decision.

J. J. BASSETT, *Chairman.*  
WM. RICE, JR., *Secretary."*

*From Middletown, Conn.*

"The enclosed are the proceedings of a meeting of the abolition members of the M. E. Church in this place, held on the evening of the 22d inst., in which the REV. J. F. HYDER presided. You are desired to make such use of them as will best advance the cause of the suffering slave. The resolutions were passed unanimously.

"Yours truly, J. G. BALDWIN.

*Middletown, Oct. 23, 1837.*

"1st. Resolved, That the principles and practices of slavery are diametrically opposed to the principles and practices taught in the Bible.

"2d. That John Wesley and the founders of the M. E. Church were abolitionists, and intended that the Church should be an abolition, as well as a temperance church.

"3d. That the great and rapidly increasing number of slave-holders in the M. E. Church, is cause of grief and alarm, and calls upon every friend of the purity, integrity and prosperity of the church, to raise their united voice against it and their persevering and unwearied efforts for its overthrow.

"4th. That the course taken by two of our bishops to suppress discussion on slavery, which, in our Discipline, is ranked with immoralities, and declared to be a 'great evil,' occasions painful surprise, and is, in our opinion, exercising an authority which they do not and ought not to possess.

"5th. That we are more than ever convinced of the great evil of slavery, and that circumstances now existing in reference to this subject, loudly call for the Convention which is to be held at Lynn on the 25th Oct.

"6th. That our hearts are with the Convention, that they have our prayers that God may direct their councils, and that we will give our full support to any Christian measures adopted by them.

"7th. That we deeply sympathize with the tens of thousands of members of our own church, and the millions who are members of no church, who are raising their imploring but manacled hands for relief.

"8th. That as we fear that God who has commanded us to "remember those in bonds as bound with them," and who will pass sentence in the judgment, by saying, "inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren ye have done it unto me,"—our efforts in this cause shall not cease but with the termination of slavery or life.

"9th. That we sincerely sympathize with our brethren in their labors and sufferings, and cor-

dially approve of their Christian efforts, in the name of God and of bleeding humanity, to free the M. E. Church from the sin of slavery.

"10th. That we feel greatly indebted to, and highly approve of ZION'S WATCHMAN, for its unflinching course in exposing the enormities of the system of slavery, and arousing the slumbering energies of the M. E. Church on this subject; and that in our opinion, it is to be one of the principal means under God for enlightening the church and the community on their duty with regard to the immediate and entire abolition of slavery;—and that therefore, we recommend this paper most cordially to the liberal patronage of our people.

J. G. BALDWIN, *Secretary.*"

The Convention passed *unanimously* the last of the above resolutions, and supported it by pledging on the spot about *eight hundred new subscribers!*

The following letters were addressed to the Convention by brethren who could not attend.

"Dear Brethren,—As it is not convenient for us to meet with you at the anticipated Convention to be held at Lynn, from several considerations which it is not necessary to mention, we would just say, that we remain firm in the great doctrines and measures of modern abolitionism. And as we believe it our duty to use our influence to promote the freedom of the press and the rights of conscience, against a time-serving and slave holding spirit, as well as against what we consider the oppressive course taken by our two bishops at the last session of our Conference—we therefore declare, that we are prepared to stand by you, should you deem it necessary to pass strong resolutions condemning slavery as it exists in our Church. And we would also say, that as we have been severely afflicted by the course taken by our two bishops at the last conference, held at Nantucket, in their positively denying us our right, as a Conference, to express an opinion against slavery, that we shall feel honored in joining our names with yours, in any prudent course you may take against these usurpations upon our rights and liberties, as ministers of Jesus Christ. As much as we love Methodism, we are not prepared to submit, tamely, to such a course. Hence we think a public expression of the views of our preachers and members against such evils is called for at this time. Yours affectionately,

HORACE MOULTON,  
PHILO HAWKS,  
SEWALL LAMBERTON,  
WILLIAM GORDON,  
JAMES O. DEAN,  
ALANSON LATHAM."

[The above are preachers in the Methodist Episcopal Church.]

From Rev. S. Kelly, of the N. H. Conference.

Montpelier, Vt. Oct. 19, 1837.

"To the Convention of Ministers and Members of the Methodist E. Church, to be held at Lynn, Mass. Oct. 25th, 1837.

"Dear Brethren,—The church of which we are members has arrived at a most fearful crisis,

and I regret exceedingly, that it will not be in my power to assemble with you, at your Convention.

"More than sixteen years ago, I was admitted into the travelling connection of the M. E. Church, and from that time to the present, I have been an ardent lover of its doctrines and institutions. But little did I then think, that the book of God would be construed by some of our ministers to support a system of oppression, cruelty and vice, "*the worst that ever saw the sun,*" and especially that annual Conferences, and a General Conference,—the highest officers of our church, and preachers of talents and influence, would be giving countenance, and with united co-operation coming up to fill the chasm in that system which is eating out the vitals of our holy religion! But so it is. We blush—we mourn, we weep, that it is so.

"Shall we be silent? Can we hold our peace? We dare not; it would be criminal in God's sight. God's suffering poor are bought and sold as beasts, goods and chattels in the shambles. They cannot speak for themselves. We must speak for the dumb. I trust the convention will speak in tones of truth and power, that will be heard through New England, through America, and felt throughout the world.

"You cannot speak in a Conference capacity and tell what you have to be "a sin against God and the inalienable rights of humanity." You will, no doubt, do it in your convention.

"Sensible I am, you need wisdom which cometh from above, and I hope while you exercise all due forbearance and affection towards slave holders, apologists for slavery, and your most bitter opponents, you will not shrink from speaking out in the omnipotency of truth.

"We love pure Methodism; and for the spread of its doctrines we labor and pray, and we mean to wear out in this service. But we deplore the connexion of our church with slavery, and for the destruction of this monster, we have drawn the sword of truth, thrown away the scabbard, buckled on the armor of righteousness, and entered into the contest. May we never return, until victory is won through all the ranks of our Israel.

"Your convention will be an important one, as it will give an opportunity to concentrate your views and plans of operation for the future. It is what the Conferences in New England need; and the course you take there, will much retard or expedite the emancipation of the slave, so far as the Methodist Church is concerned at least.

"Though I cannot witness your deliberations, yet I trust I shall be with you in spirit; praying that God will preside in all your councils and deliberations. I close by subscribing myself yours in the Gospel of Christ, and in behalf of the oppressed, SAMUEL KELLY."

REV. JOHN N. MAFFITT.

The following extracts are from an Address by JOHN N. MAFFITT, on the evening of the 4th of July, 1830, delivered in Bennett Street Church, Boston, Mass. Query—Are these his senti-

ments now?—and does he preach them in the South?

“Let not the oppressor triumph”—says a great voice from heaven. God abhors the proud. The sighing of the prisoner comes up before him. The robe of sackcloth is as beautiful in his eyes as the gorgeous attire of palaces—and the human form furrowed with the taskmaster's whip, is as acceptable to its Maker as the pampered and delicately beautiful countenance of him whom the winds of heaven have not been permitted to visit too roughly.”

“What hath Africa done, that her children should blacken beneath a heavier, more lasting curse, than ever rested on any other nation! What hath she done to thee, great America, that thou holdest her sons, her daughters, her feeble infants, in bondage, and refusest to let them go?”

“To erase from being, is to inflict but a momentary pang—while to enslave generation after generation, from the earliest dawn of life's clouded day to its dark going down, is to entail torture in such a fearful shape, as to make it bear no imaginary similitude to everlasting woe! O could we this day assemble the enslaved sons of Africa! bring forward the millions free America holds in bondage, alike regardless of human or divine rights—make the Indian islands give up their eyes, and Southern America yield her's—yeve them where, the cool winds of heaven might fan their throbbing foreheads in the amphitheatre of your broadest valley; for their numbers would throng a wide extent of territory—and there speak peace to all their troubles! We would tenderly say—Bleeding Africans! your God remembers you. He did not leave you without a promise. The mighty pulsations of joy could not be full in the mind of uncreated benevolence until, in the deep communions of His spirit with man, He had revealed Africa stretching forth her hand—her hands—for alas! she hath worn manacles, and could not lift up her iron-eaten sinews to the Avenger of nations! O Africa! this is the broad charter of thy coming freedom,—the promise of the Everlasting God.”

“The day is past, when any attempt may be expected to vindicate slavery on philosophical or religious principles. [Not quite so fast, Brother Maffitt. Little did you think, when you penned that sentence, that President Fisk and Bishop Hedding would defend slavery by Bible arguments, and the Golden Rule in 1835-7! And that two Methodist conferences would so

soon pass resolutions, saying that slavery is not a moral evil—and that another would openly license the slave trade, “providing the purposes are kind and the intentions good”—and that yet another would pass a resolution, requiring of all her candidates for ordination, a “pledge,” that they would not agitate the Church with discussions on this subject!—O Methodism, what hast thou done?] It is a horrible wrong, unjustifiable, impeached by every noble feeling that throbs the bosoms of the collective race of humanity.”

“CHRISTIAN AMERICA! I must reluctantly close my plea in behalf of enslaved millions, by charging home upon the Capitol, where the emblematic eagle spreads his broadest, boldest wing—upon every legislative hall in the slave holding States—upon magistrate and people—upon army and navy—upon plain, mountain, and river, the deep, and as yet irreversible stain of slavery. The Genius of Columbia, as she surveys from the loftiest peak of the Alleghanies the azure field where the stars are sprinkled, has also in prospect the nebulous vapors that roll up heavily from the slave-cultured earth. The eye of HEAVEN is brighter than her's of the ‘stripes and stars’—and Heaven is all ear to record every extorted groan. The solemn demand in the High Chancery of Heaven against the beloved country of my adoption and tenderest love, will not be the price of what Africa now is—but of what she would have been, if her millions who have miserably perished in inhospitable climes, like branches rent from the parent tree; had remained on the shores of her Gambia, her Niger, and had, from the genial influences of peaceful commerce and the renovations of civilization, surpassed the grandeur of her once renowned empires. It is the ghost of a mighty people that points the fleshless hand towards America—then, solemnly raising it towards Heaven, says—*I will meet thee there*—not at Philippi, in night and battle agony, but at the bar of God, under the blaze of the judgment fires, just when the highest hills in heaven are reddening with the united flames of Africa and America. I will meet thee there, to ask for my kings and queens, my sons and daughters, my cities, my national renown—and for my eternal salvation!”

“Slowly, like one stiffened in death, the accusing spectre has vanished. It is for us, my beloved countrymen—it is for us to lay this terrible spirit for ever, that he accuse us not at a moment when all that have breathed on earth—the world's gray fathers' and the latest born, shall be witnesses of our disgrace—when the hollowness of our boast of freedom shall provoke ‘the jeers of the world.’”